

Tribute to John Cope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, when civil rights, NAACP, and labor unions are discussed in California, one name automatically comes to mind. It would be difficult to assess progress in the State, and particularly in Los Angeles, without mentioning John Cope, for he has been one of the most dedicated workers in

our efforts to obtain equality of opportunity for all of our citizens.

John Cope was born in Kansas and attended the public schools of Kansas City. Upon completion of high school he matriculated at California State College in Los Angeles, earning his B.A. degree. Graduate study at San Francisco State College was followed by military service in the U.S. Army, from which he was honorably discharged.

His many years of membership in the NAACP have been highlighted by his service as newsletter editor, press and publicity chairman, labor chairman, and acting employment chairman for region I; service as project coordinator for voter registration campaigns, attendance at the last six NAACP national conven-

tions, and service as executive board member of the Fresno, Los Angeles, and Watts NAACP branches. He wrote position papers on de facto segregation in Los Angeles public schools, researched and wrote presentation of discrimination in apprenticeship programs, and compiled information for police reports in 1960 and 1961.

On May 5, 1967, the South Los Angeles—Watts—branch of the NAACP will honor John Cope with a testimonial dinner, thus giving his fellow citizens a long overdue opportunity to pay tribute to one who has worked untiringly for the improvement of our community.

I deem it a pleasure and a privilege to join in this tribute to John Cope.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: a good understanding have all they that do His commandments.—Psalm 111: 10.

O God, our Father, the Creator and Sustainer of all mankind, without whose benediction all our labor is in vain, we pray that we may build our lives not upon the shifting sands of a sacrilegious spirit but upon the eternal rock of truth and love—so we would dedicate ourselves anew to Thee. Keep us restless until we find our rest in Thee; keep us dissatisfied until we find our satisfaction in the doing of Thy will; keep us ever searching until we find the end of our seeking in our devotion to Thee and to the coming of Thy kingdom on earth.

Throughout the deliberations of this day may we be mindful of the altar within our hearts where a constant reminder of Thy presence may save us from cynicism and may lead us to a more creative life in Thee. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 823. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate oil and gas lease Las Cruces 063610; and

S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

RAILWAY LABOR ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on May 1, 1967, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

"That the Senate passed the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) entitled 'Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.'"

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, May 1, 1967, he did on that day sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Conference and certain of their employees.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK LEGISLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation, for myself and on behalf of the following members of the House Banking and Currency Committee: MESSRS. MULTER and BARRETT, MRS. SULLIVAN, MESSRS. REUSS, ASHLEY, MOOREHEAD, STEPHENS, ST GERMAIN, GONZALEZ, MINISH, HANNA, ANNUNZIO, REES, BINGHAM, and KYROS. The bill authorizes a contribution on the part of the United States to the replenish-

ment of certain of the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank.

In substance the bill authorizes the U.S. Governor to the Bank to vote for an increase in the Bank's fund for special operations. The bill provides for a U.S. contribution to the fund of \$300 million per year for the next 3 years. This represents a 20-percent increase over the last contribution made to the fund by the United States. However, it should be noted that while our contribution has been increased by 20 percent, the Latin American countries have doubled the amounts of their contribution to the fund—from \$50 million per year to \$100 million per year. The ratio of our contribution to that of our Latin American partners in progress is thereby reduced from 5 to 1 to 3 to 1. This represents a significant step forward in our policy of fostering self-help.

In addition to ourselves and the countries of Latin America, other countries have made some \$70 million in credits available to the Bank for economic development. If bond sales and the purchase of participations in Bank loans are included, the Bank has been able to mobilize a little bit more than \$200 million from the following nonmember countries: Canada, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. However, the Bank has come to recognize that certain of the capital exporting countries have benefited from Bank-financed purchases but have made either no contribution to the resources of the Bank or have made a contribution that does not bear a reasonable proportion to the benefits received. France, for example, which has consistently demonstrated a lack of sympathy to the balance-of-payments position of the United States, has benefited by Bank-financed purchases in the amount of \$23.5 million without having made any contribution whatsoever to the Bank's financing. In the light of such facts, the Bank is currently giving consideration to a proposal that would tie Bank-financed purchases to countries making a satisfactory contribution to the Bank. Hopefully such a program will further reduce the proportionate share that we assume in financ-

ing economic development in Latin America.

At the historic meeting of the Presidents of the Americas at Punta del Este, Uruguay, it was resolved that Latin America would create a common market, move toward economic integration through the sponsorship of multinational projects, increase foreign trade earnings, place increased emphasis on the agricultural sector to increase food production, promote education, science and technology, and the condition of health of the peoples of the Americas. In each and all of these endeavors the Inter-American Development Bank must play a fundamental role. Our support of the proposed legislation is the reaffirmation of our pledge to the partnership, that is the Alliance for Progress. As the Inter-American Development Bank succeeds in its efforts, so is the Alliance for Progress strengthened.

The International Finance Subcommittee—under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS—of your House Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on Wednesday, May 3, and Thursday, May 4, on this legislation, in the committee hearing room, 2128 Rayburn House Office Building. Administration witnesses will be heard on Wednesday and private parties on Thursday.

THE CERTAIN DRIFT OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the certain drift of the Federal judiciary—from the Supreme Court down to the Federal district judge—away from even remote connections with the will of the people of America has long since reached a point where remedies must be taken. Decisions of the Federal courts in matters of social significance and in the area of criminal apprehension and prosecution have rendered the Congress and the various States impotent.

Legislative functions are apparently no longer the exclusive prerogative of the Congress, and in fact the Federal courts have undertaken to legislate the law of the land, with little or no mind to either the people or the Congress. This tendency, in addition to extralegal tactics of the various Federal administrative bodies called guidelines, has today stripped the Congress of its constitutional function and removed government from the reach of the people.

These activities of the Federal courts and the executive branch have been undertaken over the past two or three decades quietly, with almost no opposition from the Congress. However, some Members in the past have objected and proposed remedies. One of the proposals called for a constitutional amendment which would require the election of Fed-

eral judges, including the Justices of the Supreme Court.

The oligarchy which is the Supreme Court has, beginning in late years with the 1954 Brown decision through its one-man, one-vote decision affecting congressional reapportionment, acted without any semblance of a mandate from the electorate. It is high time these self-appointed legislators faced the people and gave an account of their stewardship.

The latest court-decreed legislation passed by the coalition with the executive branch is the fifth circuit court's ruling on integration of State-controlled public schools in seven Southern States, which upholds the guidelines laid down by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in defiance of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This action effectively destroys public education at the State level and superimposes upon the people by executive and judicial decree a Federal school system.

I am convinced that a majority of the people of America feel that the judges and the administrative bodies, rather than the Congress, are making the laws which govern this land, and they want the right to temper their laws without Federal bayonets stuck in their faces.

The alternative is to elect competent judges and jurists to sit in our courts both large and small, so that every ruling of the Federal judiciary will no longer be aimed at merely one section of the country or at one element of our society. The question is, Whose policies are the judges carrying out? If these are the people's policies, then they should not be afraid to face the electorate and run for election periodically, just as other officials must do.

AN EDITORIAL ENTITLED "WHEN COURTS IGNORE REASON, THE PEOPLE MUST RESTORE IT"

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an editorial entitled, "When Courts Ignore Reason, the People Must Restore It." Mr. Loyal Frisbie, editor of the Polk County Democrat, one of the outstanding biweekly newspapers of our Nation, expresses well the problem that occurs when a bad situation created by bureaucracy is compounded by the action of the courts. His editorial is self-explanatory. However, I would like to point out that the county of Polk has an area of 1,861 square miles. All school attendance areas in the county have been abolished because of this court order with the choice of a school to attend being left entirely to the student and his parent. If reason does not prevail, chaos will follow in this ridiculous situation wherein a school will have to accept any

and every student whether or not there is classroom space for that student.

The editorial follows:

WHEN COURTS IGNORE REASON, THE PEOPLE MUST RESTORE IT

If there has remained a doubt in anyone's mind that the Federal courts have taken over operation of the public school systems in the various states, yesterday's action by the Polk County school board should dispel that doubt.

After weeks of harassment by petty federal officials, and under the gun of the Federal District Court in Tampa, the school board yesterday abolished all attendance areas in the county. The choice of a school to attend is left entirely to the individual students and their parents.

Provided the school of his choice is not overcrowded, a student must be accepted, whether that school is next door, across town or across the county. And it isn't sufficient for school officials to say "Sorry, we're full." The county board must make an effort to secure enough portable classrooms to care for the overflow, where one develops. And if the distance to be traveled is greater than that already established as reasonable for walking, the board must provide for transportation, or be ready to give a mighty good reason why not.

These ridiculous ideas are not the invention nor the wish of Polk County school officials. They were adopted yesterday in strict accordance with a December ruling of a 12 judge Federal Court panel, meeting in New Orleans.

Although the ruling came in a case specifically involving a county in Mississippi, it applies to all counties within the Fifth Circuit—which includes Florida.

Polk's school board announced promptly after the New Orleans decision that, notwithstanding its Federal Court-approved integration plan, which had another two years to go, it would complete classroom integration in one year. This still wasn't enough to satisfy the Justice Department representative with whom Polk officials tried to negotiate an orderly schedule for completing the changeover.

Finally, in the opinion of the school board's attorney and other top county school officials, there was nothing left to do but to throw the entire county into one huge attendance area, without rhyme or reason.

All that the Federal Courts are interested in, of course, is full compliance with a series of Supreme Court orders requiring complete racial integration—as though that would solve all of this nation's social problems in one massive push. But in the sweeping decision handed down in New Orleans, as in others of similar content, the effect is to go far beyond the outlawing of discrimination based on race.

For instance, under yesterday's school board action, Bartow High School students wishing to take courses offered in the bigger high schools of Lakeland and Winter Haven, but not available here, could choose to enroll in those schools. So could students now attending Fort Meade and Frostproof High Schools.

Absurd? Of course. But a Federal Court order is the law of the land, reasonable or not. Not even the Constitution can stand in the way, if the courts hold that its words don't mean what they have previously been thought to mean.

One section of yesterday's school board resolution forbids the publishing of names or addresses of students who have exercised a choice of what school to attend. This, on its face, denies to newspapers access to public records, and the right to publish those records. To most people, both lawyers and laymen, this looks like a violation of the First Amendment which guarantees, among other rights, the freedom of speech and of the press.

This is a right which Polk school officials have always scrupulously observed . . . until the 12 judges in New Orleans ruled otherwise.

Incidentally, the possible withholding of Federal school funds is not involved in this case. Failure to comply absolutely with the court decree could land the board members and the county superintendent in contempt of court, which can have most unpleasant consequences.

Yesterday's forced school board action could bring utter chaos to the county school system in the 1967-68 school year. It is up to Polk County's level-headed citizens of good will, regardless of color, to see that this doesn't happen.

By all means, let there be end to discrimination and to forcible segregation, but also let there be calm and reasonable use of the carte blanche which the school board has adopted.

L.B.J.: DESPITE HIS CRITICS, HE PROVIDES SOUND LEADERSHIP

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent editorial, the Abilene Reporter-News of April 26, 1967, cogently sums up President Johnson's leadership in the Vietnam struggle in the face of vicious personal attacks and irresponsible criticism. Says the Reporter-News:

All the while the President carefully steers a middle policy course, trying cautiously to step up the pressure of war to bring it to an end rather than a nuclear holocaust.

I think most Americans agree that our President is steering us through dangerous waters with sure hands and careful judgment. He is doing so at a time when diverse political factions are hammering at him and loudly berating his policies. I commend President Johnson for ignoring these loud, divisive voices.

I commend him for honoring our commitments to the people of South Vietnam. I commend him for upholding our Nation's commitment to maintain the best possible support for our military forces now in the field.

I think the Abilene Reporter-News speaks for the majority of Americans in supporting the President in Vietnam. I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS WAR CRITICS—AN ANALYSIS

There has never been a dilemma like it, and because this is so, President Johnson bears burdens and frustrations unlike any of his predecessors knew.

This is not to say he is the only President ever to know crisis. Far from it. But his (they are many) are set apart by the peculiarities of this age.

As Commander in Chief, he must fight a war which was not of his making, which he regrets, but which he is convinced involves America's present and future vital interests as well as those of the free world.

On the one side he is assailed by a large body of critics who want to wade into North Vietnam with our full military force and win the war quickly.

On the opposite pole are the peace demonstrators, the marching agitators, who demand we pull out.

Still a third group, and the one troubling the President most, are the "doves" of the U.S. Senate and intellectual community who clamor for him to seek peace while indeed he is seeking peace.

All the while, the President carefully steers a middle policy course, trying cautiously to step up the pressure of war to bring it to an end rather than a nuclear holocaust.

Let's examine the positions of all three groups of critics.

Sure, we have the awesome power to wipe out the Communist North Vietnamese. But would both Communist China and Soviet Russia, singly or collectively, stand idly by? The coffee cup experts, even senators and congressmen and military men, say they wouldn't dare interfere.

But only one man—the President himself, can make this decision and he must bear the responsibility for it. Only he—not even the best informed men in the Senate and House—have minute to minute access to all the information gathered by our intelligence system all over the world.

Even he is not sure, but it is he who must calculate the risk of whether such action would plunge the world into a nuclear war from which none would rise.

Then, should we pull out and turn South Vietnam over to the Communists, which is what the extreme peaceniks mean? Certainly not, and it is not for so transparent an issue as saving face, but because if we quit on our commitment, then the framework of the whole free world which rests wholly on our word, would collapse. Vice President Humphrey restated this in his speech last Friday to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington.

Finally, to the doves who exhort Johnson to seek peace. Senator Charles Percy of Illinois, for instance, told the ASNE in a Saturday luncheon address that the United States should strive harder for peace, seeking it "with at least as much vigor and invention as we now pursue war."

Where, pray tell, has the senator been these many months, not to know that President Johnson has, indeed, been seeking peace with "at least as much vigor" as he has pursued war? It takes two to make peace, and Ho Chi Minh declared as recently as February he would have none of it.

We close this think piece with some words spoken in New York Monday by Merriman Smith, UPI White House reporter and Pulitzer Prize winner who expressed dismay at the vicious personal attacks on President Johnson. He said:

"Believe me, this is the time for the American public to take some responsibility for its own image and stop blaming everything on either Lyndon Johnson or Drew Pearson. Mr. Johnson—in fact, no president—deserves the indignities being heaped upon him these days in the name of peace or civil rights."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON MAY 2 AND 3, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during general debate on May 2 and 3, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is a Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ARLINE AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1971) for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

WILLIAM JOHN MASTERSON ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2048) for the relief of William John Masterton, George Samuel Konik, and Louis Vincent Nanne.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

E. F. FORT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1596) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1630) for relief of Rose Minutillo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1630

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Mrs. Rose Minutillo, of Brooklyn, New York, the amount certified to him by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to section 2 of this Act. The payment of such amount shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Rose Minutillo for a pension under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the period beginning on December 14, 1944, through December 17, 1962, on account of the death of her husband, John Minutillo (Veterans' Administration claim number XC 2-935-738). No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services

rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount that Mrs. Rose Minutillo, of Brooklyn, New York, would have received as pension for the period beginning on December 14, 1944, through December 17, 1962, on account of the death of her husband, John Manutillo, if she had filed a proper claim for such pension on December 14, 1944.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. M. M. RICHWINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3717) for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AGNES C. STOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3010 of title 38, United States Code, relating to effective dates for awards, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds appropriated for dependency and indemnity compensation, to Agnes C. Stowe, of Pensacola, Florida, a sum equal to the amount which would have been payable to her as dependency and indemnity compensation for the period from June 4, 1959, the date of the death of her husband, Ansell M. Stowe, who died as the result of a service-connected disability, through April 27, 1962, the effective date of the award of such compensation, had entitlement to such compensation been allowed from the date of death of the said Ansell M. Stowe: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUGET SOUND PLYWOOD, INC., OF TACOMA, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4949) for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5970) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS and Mr. TALCOTT objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DINO J. CATERINI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6445) for the relief of Dino J. Caterini.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROBERT M. GILKEY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6446) for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PATTERSON, EAGLE, GREENOUGH & DAY, ESQS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1885) for the relief of Patterson, Eagle, Greenough & Day, Esqs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama and Mr. GROSS objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

U.S. EMBASSY IN DENMARK PROMOTING DANISH MINK IMPORTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to learn from a recently published report that the U.S. Embassy in Denmark was promoting Danish mink imports into the United States. The report, in the Fur Age Weekly, pictured

American mink buyers and the managing director of Danish Fur Sales together at a cocktail party at the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen. The publication called the Embassy function "an unprecedented gesture by an American Ambassador."

With millions of dollars being lost by American mink farmers due to low prices and increased mink imports, I wonder about the wisdom of the U.S. Embassy in Denmark conducting social activities that encourage more mink imports from that country.

Since increased mink imports from Denmark and other countries are beating down the price American mink farmers receive for their pelts, it is highly questionable for our Embassy to be glad-handing commercial interests who insist on bypassing American mink for Danish mink. That is why I last week introduced the mink import control bill, to restrict mink imports which unfairly compete with domestic producers.

The possible ramifications of the Embassy party in Copenhagen are but another reason why price-depressing mink imports should be curtailed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONGRESSMEN URGE INCREASE IN SOLDIERS HOME BENEFITS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] and I are joining the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] in introducing a bill to increase the Federal reimbursement for care given veterans in State veterans' homes.

Increasing costs have made present reimbursements both unrealistic and sadly outdated.

The Veterans' Administration, under title 38 of the United States Code, now reimburses State soldiers' and sailors' homes for 50 percent of operating costs, but this payment cannot exceed \$2.50 a day for domiciliary patients and \$3.50 a day for nursing patients.

Obviously, these payments come nowhere near the 50-percent figure. In the case of the New Hampshire Soldiers Home, figures show that it now costs between \$8 and \$10 a day to provide domiciliary care and \$15 to \$18 a day for nursing care for patients.

Our bill would increase these Federal reimbursements to a maximum of \$3.50 a day for domiciliary and \$5 a day for nursing patients, still short of the 50-percent target, but a more realistic figure in view of today's costs.

If some such increase in Veterans' Administration payments is not provided, many States will have no alternative but to curtail their already minimal services to needy veterans, something none of us want.

I therefore call to my colleagues' attention this bill, and urge them to support it.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, according to today's New York Times, Secretary McNamara has issued a memorandum to his subordinates stating that news management would not be tolerated in the Department of Defense. It has never occurred to me before that the Secretary has a sense of humor.

Considering past performances, I cannot help but question the credibility of this story. In the first place, it emanates from the Pentagon's Office of Public Affairs. The head of that office from January 21, 1961, to February 3, 1967, was Arthur Sylvester. And Mr. Sylvester is the man who once said:

It's inherent in government's right to lie to save itself.

When the Administration is on the defensive under our political system, I would always be suspicious of what it said.

On another occasion, he said:

Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that?—Stupid.

The Secretary himself, not his subordinates, is the man who has done more to destroy credibility at the Pentagon than any other individual. Whether this can be attributed to news management or stupidity, I cannot say. However, the continual application of the label "Whiz Kids" to McNamara and those surrounding him would seem to rule out the latter. And that leaves the question of credibility.

In 1963, Secretary McNamara said:

I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries.

Three months later, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee reported:

The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere.

On November 21, 1963, the Secretary said:

We are equally encouraged by the prospects for progress in the war against the Viet-Cong.

Two months later, he said:

The Viet Cong moved in . . . and had many successes during the period of November and December.

It was about this time, of course, that Mr. McNamara said that American participation in the war would be over by the end of 1965.

In early 1964 McNamara told us that the successor to the Diem government "has considerably more popular support than its predecessor." Two days later that government was overthrown.

In early March 1964, he said:

We are confident these plans point the way to victory.

In late March 1964, he said:

The road ahead is going to be long, difficult, and frustrating.

In July of 1964, McNamara reported an improvement in the morale of the Vietnamese, but the very next month a state of emergency was declared, and widespread rioting followed.

When American ground forces were sent to Vietnam and the big buildup began in 1965, Secretary McNamara assured us that "they would not tangle with the Vietcong." Shortly thereafter, a military spokesman in Saigon said these troops would render combat support and, if necessary, fighting.

By November of 1965, McNamara could tell the American people:

We have stopped losing the war.

And yet, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], during the time we were supposedly losing the war, Secretary McNamara made optimistic statements as to the war's progress on no less than 14 separate occasions.

About a year ago, the minority leader made a statement to the effect that there was a bomb shortage in Vietnam. Secretary McNamara hastily called a press conference to rebut the charges. But the next day, the Pentagon admitted it was repurchasing bombs that had been sold to West Germany for \$1.70 each and now paying \$21 apiece to get them back.

Also last year, when Under Secretary of State George Ball said that political turmoil in Vietnam had not affected military operations, McNamara contradicted him 10 days later.

Members of the opposition party have questioned the reliability of the Pentagon's estimate of Vietcong wounded. The Secretary has given estimates of the size of the North Vietnamese army that conflict with General Westmoreland's.

Early last month, McNamara said there would be no need for bombing Mig bases. Last week, those bases were attacked.

I remember that a reporter once asked Mr. McNamara why we were not winning friends to our Vietnamese policy. The Secretary's candid reply was, "The trouble is our credibility was destroyed."

I certainly agree with Mr. McNamara's order that news management must cease at the Pentagon. I only hope that copy of the order was delivered back to the Secretary's Office.

THE COST OF THE DECLINE IN URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. Roth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the cost to America, in human and monetary terms, resulting from the continuing decline of urban and rural areas, is too great for

even this richest of nations to afford. The waste inherent in the degradation and shame of our slum dwellers, the cost of deteriorating sections of our cities and towns, these cost the American people staggering sums annually. Recognizing this, I am happy to join with many of my colleagues in sponsoring the National Home Ownership Foundation Act.

This plan adopts a different approach than earlier proposals aimed at remedying the ills of our declining neighborhoods. While the Federal Government plays a vital role as a stimulus and guarantor, the task of accomplishing the rebuilding of local areas will be left with local organizations. In this way, by enlisting the aid of local business, labor, finance, and low-income people themselves, we can make a broad-front assault upon the problems of our declining neighborhoods.

By assisting these lower income Americans to obtain loans with which they may buy their own homes, we will give them a stake in their own neighborhoods, we will encourage them to use their efforts and initiative to rebuild their surroundings, we will restore their pride in themselves. This approach, it seems to me, placing responsibility on the individual's shoulders, rather than making him heavily reliant on Government initiative, effort, and money, will involve and motivate more people than existing programs.

The Foundation created by this plan would be empowered to raise some \$2 billion through the sale of bonds to private investors. The Foundation itself, though created by congressional act, would be a private, nonprofit corporation, headed by a board of directors made up of representatives of various sectors of the economy. It would provide technical assistance to local homeownership organizations, and make loans to local organizations and individuals in the event other financial institutions were unable to do so. Under this proposal, the resources, both financial and intellectual, of business, labor, banking, and the people directly affected would be brought to bear on the problems of our declining urban and rural areas.

The approach embodied in the National Home Ownership Foundation Act seeks to bring into the attack on the problems of the cities the full force and initiative of the free enterprise system. This proposal represents a long-range investment in America. I hope Congress in its wisdom will give the plan the consideration it merits.

DEATH TAX ON YOUTH LEADERSHIP TRAINING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a special order today to call before the attention of the country, and of the Congress, some new regulations that were issued by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on Friday, April 14, 1967. This date may well be remembered in history as "black Friday" for over 700 of the Nation's cultural, education, scientific, trade, and labor organizations since the IRS, in all their assumed "divine" inspired wisdom, decided to impose a 48-percent "death" tax on the net advertising income—these organizations derive from their publications.

Two organizations that will feel the full brunt of the bureaucratic edict will be the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts.

The national executive director of the Girl Scouts of America, Louise A. Wood has informed me by letter on April 26, 1967, of the following effect of the IRS ruling on their worthwhile organization:

Ours is an organization chartered by the Congress to bring the Girl Scout program to all girls, seven thru seventeen years of age, wherever they are. Our primary source of income is the \$1.00 membership dues from our members. At present we reach three million girls, or one out of every seven in the girl population seven to seventeen years of age. An important service to these girls is the *American Girl* magazine published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. as a companion to our program by translating our Girl Scout purposes and beliefs into magazine form.

Subscriptions do not cover the cost of the *American Girl* magazine. Advertising appropriate to girl activity and magazine content is also sought. The sale of advertising helps to meet the cost, and at present additional subsidy is also required from Girl Scout operations. If our limited advertising revenue were to be taxed in the future, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. would have to reduce its other services for girls accordingly. In fact the question would probably have to be faced whether Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. could continue to publish this important vehicle to youth.

The *Leader* magazine is also published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. It is our major means of communication to our six hundred thousand adult volunteer members, most of whom serve as Girl Scout leaders. There is no subscription to the *Leader* magazine. Advertising revenue only partially supports this magazine. As in the case of the *American Girl* magazine, any tax to be paid on this revenue would result in further reduction of services to our membership.

Mr. Speaker, a similar effect will be felt by the Boy Scouts of America, as indicated by the following communication from the Boy Scout organization:

THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING

Boys' Life is a specialized magazine reaching a very particular market. There is a limit to the range of advertisers to whom we can make any appeal, and there is a limit on the amount of money these advertisers are willing to spend to reach our specialized audience. These factors introduce restrictions on the specialty magazine not experienced by the general magazine. Advertising rates have been increased systematically. (Appendix A to Enclosure III)

The acceptance of advertising by Boys' Life serve two purposes: 1. It provides a major source of revenue to help meet publishing costs, and 2. it serves to introduce the boy into the competitive economy of which he is rapidly becoming a part. Advertising helps him in the development of brand preference and the ability to buy sensibly.

Advertising revenue is essential to the publication of the magazine, since subscription income averages less than production and distribution costs. The following chart indicates the deficit incurred when production operating costs per subscription are related to subscription income.

Year and deficit	Cents
1954-----	68
1960-----	67
1964-----	77
1966-----	84

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Beside the additional financial burden placed on the Scouting movement by this regulation, I have yet to find any authority giving the IRS such power, and have yet to discover any legislative history conferring such power. The IRS in no way based its new proposed regulation on any new law recently enacted by Congress, but attempts to demonstrate its authority on a 1950 statute. This 1950 amendment to the Internal Revenue Code was passed for the purpose of curbing an abuse on the part of certain tax-exempt organizations that were acquiring regular commercial businesses not related to the tax-exempt organizations. The "cause celebre," which triggered the 1950 law was a New York University's operation of a macaroni factory.

In an extensive review of the legislative history relating to the 1950 amendments neither I, nor my staff, have yet to discover any mention—or congressional condoning—of the presently proposed IRS regulations relating to the advertising income derived from publications of the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or other tax-exempt organizations.

There are two references that occurred during both the Senate and House debate, which might shed some light upon this dark and unpleasant situation. First, is a colloquy between the late Senator George and Senator Saltonstall to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1950, on pages 15515 to 15516:

Mr. GEORGE. The amendments of the Senate relating to unrelated business activities of tax-exempt organizations, lease-backs, and prohibited transactions between a trust or foundation and the donor or creator, and members of the family was agreed to by the House conferees. The House conferees also agreed to the elimination of the tax on accumulations. However, the House conferees insisted on some provision being written in the bill to prevent unreasonable accumulations contrary to the purposes of the trust and to prevent the investment of accumulated funds in such a manner as to jeopardize the interests of the beneficiary. The House conferees also insisted that the provision should require that the funds must not be used to a substantial degree for other than charitable purposes. This last change was intended to prevent a grantor from setting up a trust accumulating the income, and using it as a credit reserve for his business. I believe that under existing law, such activities would justify the Treasury in holding that a charitable trust did not exist. Similar rules are provided under the House change in the case of private foundations. The Senate conferees agreed to these changes.

It is confidently believed that these provisions may be effectively used to prevent abuses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts correctly understand from what the Senator from Georgia has just stated that the rules concerning ordinary investments of charitable organizations such as hospitals or universities are not changed in any way? They are exempt from taxation as they are now, are they not? The provision the Senator from Georgia has just read does not apply to the ordinary investments of a university, does it?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not think it would apply unless there was an unusual withholding or failure to distribute or use the earnings over a longer period of time than might be necessary. I do not think ordinarily they would apply to colleges or hospitals. The Senator was confining his question to colleges or hospitals?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was confining my statement to hospitals, universities, or charitable organizations of that kind; organizations exempt from taxation.

Mr. GEORGE. No; it would not apply to them. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These new rules are set up to avoid abuses where an industrial establishment is bought by a charitable institution; and such abuses have occurred in the past.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Second, is a statement by Representative Jenkins during the House debate which occurred on June 28, 1950, and is to be found on page 9357 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date. This is the only reference which even remotely approaches any reference to the subject at hand:

There is no question that something should be done about stopping these loopholes and I compliment the committee for having taken action to stop some of this loophole invasion. The principal loophole invasion, I think, comes from what we call unrelated properties. Where somebody dies, for instance, and leaves a hardware store to a college and that college goes ahead and runs the hardware store in competition to another hardware store. In that case they ought to pay taxes on that hardware store. They ought to pay their fair share of taxes. That is what this bill does in that respect, and it does a good job, I think.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite apparent from the aforementioned statements that it was never the intent—or will—of Congress that the 1950 amendments, which the IRS rely upon, were ever intended to apply to the advertising income of tax-exempt organizations. Nowhere in the hearings, reports, nor House debate does the word "advertising" nor the phrase "advertising income" appear. I also think it is quite apparent that the IRS has greatly exceeded its authority by issuing these regulations without first obtaining congressional approval. It further seems absurd, that it has taken some 17 years before that IRS received "divine revelation" so as to apply these new regulations to the statute.

I mentioned previously that this was a dark situation. No one seems to be more in the dark and in a confused state than the IRS themselves. They have yet to come up with any type of list of the so-called 700 organizations or publications that would be affected under their arbitrary ruling, nor have they dared to project the amount of tax revenue that would be generated to the Fed-

eral coffers. They are much in the same situation as a blind man trying to walk a tight rope in a pitch black room wearing roller skates.

"ALLEGED" REASONS FOR THE IRS PROPOSAL

There has also been much discussion that the present exemption held by the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts amounts to unfair competition and is discriminatory in regard to commercial publications. In examining the Boy Scouts' official publication, *Boys' Life*, I discover that there are a great deal of advertisements contained within it that pertain to camping and academic matters, uniforms, and merit badges that are of particular interest to Scouters. Surely *Time*, *Look*, *Vogue*, or even *Playboy*, do not decry this kind of competition.

The IRS estimates that the total advertising receipts of the publications of this undetermined number of tax-exempt organizations runs in the neighborhood of \$100 million per annum. The overall amount spent on advertising in America during 1966 was \$15.12 billion according to U.S. Department of Commerce Handbook. That means that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total advertising revenue accrued to these nonprofit organizations. I am quite sure that the American people, the commercial publications, and the Federal budget can afford this present exemption that is granted these outstanding organizations.

SERVICES RENDERED BY SCOUTING

What functions do the Scouts perform that the Internal Revenue Service now wish to circumscribe? They are in the forefront of efforts to curb juvenile delinquency, to instill a spirit of patriotism and community service, to encourage good mental, physical, and moral habits, to help youngsters grow in body and mind so as to become better citizens, to provide training for leadership in the world they will one day inherit. One out of every seven girls between the ages of 7 and 17 belong to the Girl Scouts—almost 3 million girls. Over 275 Members of this House have had an association with the Boy Scouts ranging from membership to positions of local, regional, and national leadership. Both organizations have been chartered by Congress which has applauded their work, goals, and purposes. They receive nothing in the way of Federal subsidies. They are voluntary organizations.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue is not so much who must pay tax on advertising income as it is who shall decide who must pay the tax on advertising income. Congress has made no such declaration. Yet, 17 years after the fact, and in the absence of any further legislation, the Internal Revenue Service says it was the intent of Congress to tax the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts.

Thus Congress is placed in the ludicrous position of having to pass legislation to prevent something from happening, instead of passing legislation to cause something to happen. This, in my opinion, was never the intent of Congress, but it shows how far we have come along on the road to government by men instead of government by law.

According to the information pub-

lished in the Federal Register, these organizations have just 30 days to present any arguments, and then the rules contained in the final regulations will be applied to the tax years beginning after the date of their final adoption.

It is my hope that the Congress make clear in no uncertain terms its displeasure with this presumption of power and authority by an agency of the executive branch.

I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter I received from the Girl Scouts of America and a memorandum from the Boy Scouts of America:

GIRL SCOUTS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1967.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is concerned about the possible adverse impact of the proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service having to do with the taxability of unrelated income. We are fearful that this proposal, if made applicable to us, would limit future services to our Girl Scouts.

Ours is an organization chartered by the Congress to bring the Girl Scout program to all girls, seven thru seventeen years of age, wherever they are. Our primary sources of income is the \$1.00 membership dues from our members. At present we reach three million girls, or one out of every seven in the girl population seven to seventeen years of age. An important service to these girls is the *American Girl* magazine published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. as a companion to our program by translating our Girl Scout purposes and beliefs into magazine form.

Subscriptions do not cover the cost of the *American Girl* magazine. Advertising appropriate to girl activity and magazine content is also sought. The sale of advertising helps to meet the cost, and at present additional subsidy is also required from Girl Scout operations. If our limited advertising revenue were to be taxed in the future, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. would have to reduce its other services for girls accordingly. In fact the question would probably have to be faced whether Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. could continue to publish this important vehicle to youth.

The *Leader* magazine is also published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. It is our major means of communication to our six hundred thousand adult volunteer members, most of whom serve as Girl Scout leaders. There is no subscription to the *Leader* magazine. Advertising revenue only partially supports this magazine. As in the case of the *American Girl* magazine, any tax to be paid on this revenue would result in further reduction of services to our membership.

It is our plea and hope that you can share our message appropriately so that the threat to our program which is implied in the pending Internal Revenue Service regulations will be understood by those responsible for action in this area.

Very truly yours,

LOUISE A. WOOD,
National Executive Director.

BOYS' LIFE

PURPOSE OF THE MAGAZINE

The purpose and policy of *Boys' Life* shall be to publish a periodical for all boys of Scout age providing wholesome stories and other material of interest and educational value which will stimulate ambition and help character development of boys. All stories and material shall be in harmony with the principles of Scouting as laid down in

the Scout Oath and Law. (National Bylaws Article XXIII, Section 2, page 96)

HISTORICAL STATEMENT

The Boy Scouts of America acquired *Boys' Life* magazine as a program supplement in the early days of the movement (1912). The growth of the magazine has been, until recent years, gradual. The early years of publication were accomplished only by sizeable subsidies from the National Council. *Boys' Life* magazine is prepared primarily for the membership of the movement, although it is available to all on a subscription basis.

A major emphasis of the program of the Boy Scouts of America is the stimulation of good reading as a means of helping mold character. To this end *Boys' Life* has been developed and promoted. Future effectiveness of the magazine will be possible only if its quality is continually improved and the highest type of advertising sought to underwrite the costs.

There is evidence of a strong correlation between the lack of reading ability or interests and juvenile delinquency. It is well accepted that the good readers experience increased comprehension and understanding.

If it became necessary to build a case for the specialty publication and its need for non-profit status, considerations should be given to the influence of this publication on the cultural, economic, and social course of the country. *Boys' Life* magazine is dedicated to good reading and to the support and strengthening of the Scouting program which has as its main aim the building of citizenship in today's youth and tomorrow's leaders. If privileged rating represents an assist to publications of this kind, then it evidences the concern our country feels for those programs that have as their particular emphasis the strengthening and building of citizens of this nation.

Those parents who truly care about exposure of their children's minds to something better than the torrent of trivia in comic books and on the air, depend on these books (*Children and Youth Publications*). But home budgets are thin for items such as these. (John K. Herbert, President, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc. in a statement before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, United States Senate April, 1962)

During the 1962 Congressional hearings on the proposed postal bill, the Boy Scouts of America presented its concern over the affect of postal rate increases in a letter to Senator Olin D. Johnston. (Enclosure I) During this period certain statements were made suggesting that nonprofit publications should carry a greater proportion of mail expense. The proponents of this philosophy have by and large discounted the values of these publications to the over-all cultural, economic and social growth of the country, an admittedly intangible but highly necessary consideration.

THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING

Boys' Life is a specialized magazine reaching a very particular market. There is a limit to the range of advertisers to whom we can make any appeal, and there is a limit on the amount of money these advertisers are willing to spend to reach our specialized audience. These factors introduce restrictions on the specialty magazine not experienced by the general magazine. Advertising rates have been increased systematically.

The acceptance of advertising by *Boys' Life* serves two purposes: It provides a major source of revenue to help meet publishing costs, and it serves to introduce the boy into the competitive economy of which he is rapidly becoming a part. Advertising helps him in the development of brand preference and the ability to buy sensibly.

Advertising revenue is essential to the publication of the magazine, since subscription income averages less than production and

distribution costs. The following chart indicates the deficit incurred when production operating costs per subscription are related to subscription income.

Year and deficit

1954	-----	68
1960	-----	67
1964	-----	77
1966	-----	84

It is this deficit that is covered through advertising revenue.

A comparison of our page cost per one thousand circulation with those of other specialized audience magazines indicated that ours is only slightly lower.

If operating expenses are proportionately less than regular magazines, it should be remembered that expenses for securing circulation sales are not a major expense as they are with general publications. These savings are passed on to the subscriber, again with a view toward making the magazine available to as many as possible.

The magazine industry as a whole points out the dilemma.

"There are people who seem to believe that we can automatically transfer the costs of postage increases to our readers and to our advertisers. As publishers, we know this is not the case.

"Perhaps the best way to convey to you the dilemma the publisher faces is to present the kind of competition that the television set offers today.

"Television uses the public's airways without charge, and pays no special taxes to enter millions of American homes. The entertainment it offers free competes for the leisure time which people also have available for reading the magazines that they buy.

"Now, few families buy only one magazine. Most subscribe to two or three or more. If the price of all goes up, will all these publications be continued or, thinking of the TV-consumed time, isn't it likely that the family cuts one or more from the subscription list? Of course." (John K. Herbert, President, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc. in a statement before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, United States Senate April 1962)

If the magazine industry at large is limited in its ability to handle increased costs, the Boy Scouts of America is in an even more vulnerable position. To alter or affect the operation of Boys' Life magazine would risk damage to the total structure of the movement. "Net income" from the Boys' Life operation is not profit in the usually understood sense, since it is applied to the broader purposes of Scouting. Boys' Life does not provide profit for distribution to owners or stock holders as would be true with general publications.

Approximately 83% (1966) of Boys' Life total circulation is acquired through membership subscriptions. The cost of securing this circulation is extremely low since all subscription sales efforts are carried on by the volunteer leaders and local council offices at no expense to the magazine.

CONSIDERATIONS

When Congress chartered the Boy Scouts of America, it provided that it might conduct its business and affairs and generally do all such acts and things as may be necessary to promote the purposes of said corporation. This excerpt from Section 2 of the Charter together with the stated purpose of Boys' Life should place the operation of the magazine in its proper perspective.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Snyder said when referring to taxation of such organizations:

"Our tax laws have long recognized the principle that organizations operated for worthy public purposes should be encouraged by tax exemption."

The advertising policy of the Boy Scouts

of America states that advertisements accepted for publication must not depend on support or endorsement of the Boy Scouts of America. Further, the advertiser is expected to receive a fair return for his advertisement consistent with his expectation of returns from non-Scout advertising media.

No little amount of criticism from "some trade associations" may stem from the debate that has been waged over postal regulations. Boys' Life along with the publications of other non-profit organizations, enjoys a rate not available to "regular publications." It can be said that under proposed legislation the postal rate for non-profit publications will increase nearly 50% in the next three years. At the same time the "for profit" publication will experience a rate increase on editorial matter only of 21%. (Enclosure V) Those increases suggest that the non-profit organizations are carrying their proportionate share of the increases based on previously accepted formulas. In reviewing advertising revenue, the industry average income per advertising page has increased 69% since 1956. Boys' Life magazine advertising revenue for the same period increased 86%.

J. K. Lasser reports that in 1963 median profit before federal taxes for magazines, distributed primarily by subscription, with advertising incomes of 20% to 40% of total income was 9%. In the case of Boys' Life 1963 income was 11.1% of the gross. Both the dollar income and the percent of gross have dropped. In 1966 the income was \$397,000 or 6.6% of the gross. It should be recorded that the percentage would actually be lower were varying sales promotion efforts charged against the operation of the magazine. This is not done, and therefore it seems justifiable to apply the income to the promotion of the total Scouting program. To do this makes the boy the ultimate beneficiary of the voluntary promotion effort and effective staff management of Boys' Life magazine.

In the last 10 years the magazine industry has experienced a 3% growth in advertising volume (pages) while Boys' Life has had a 3½% decline.

The creation of circumstances that produce income that is in turn put to direct use in carrying out the Scouting program is good management of the assets of the movement directed toward the ultimate extension of Scouting and fulfillment of its chartered purpose. In fact, this income represents no more a drain on the economy and siphoning off of dollars from taxable operations than does the operational economies in any phase of the business operation of non-profit groups.

Wise application of purchasing principles reduces the cost to the purchaser and consequently the income to the supplier. However, no one will question this conservation of money even though it leads to smaller profits for those who do business with the non-profit group.

When a non-profit group uses its assets (terminology, insignia, program) to create circumstances wherein its ultimate purposes are more nearly achieved, this is sound management.

Over the years, first the Congress, later the courts, and more recently the Internal Revenue Service, have all found by their action that Scouting is definitely beneficial to the country to a degree that justifies some consideration of its economic needs. It is essential to the continued growth of the Scouting movement that it be allowed to use its assets wisely in the achievement of its purpose.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MARSH. I would like to com-

mend the gentleman for taking the floor to discuss this subject today.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question. If this new regulation were adopted, would it not apply to other great professional organizations such as the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the National Education Association, and the American Nurses Association? Would it not also operate against them?

Mr. HALL. The gentleman has put his finger exactly on the point. It is my understanding that it will be applicable to about 700 tax-exempt nonprofit organizations which are primarily educational and cultural, and which depend upon house organs and advertising therein to pay therefore to carry on the education. It will also apply to labor union publications insofar as education of their union members are concerned, and many others.

We have not been able, I will say to the gentleman before yielding further, to obtain an exact list of these nonprofit organizations from the Bureau of Internal Revenue Service.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would just like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling this matter to the attention of the Members of the House. This is a direct outgrowth of a case of IRS against the Sierra Club, when certain people in Congress objected to an advertisement which was run by that organization in certain local papers calling attention of their Members in the Congress to certain bills that were here being considered by the Congress. If this goes unchallenged by the Congress itself, not only the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts but every other tax-exempt organization will have its publications challenged.

I think that you are rendering a tremendous service, not only to the Members of the House, but also to the country in calling this to our attention and to see to it that the IRS is brought back in line, and that the act of 1950 is interpreted as Congress intended it.

Mr. HALL. I certainly thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I did not know that the crystallizing factor had been the case which he refers to with proper legal lexicon, but I am glad to have that information, and I submit to the Congress and to the people of the Nation that not only will publications educational and cultural in nature of these tax-exempt organizations be taken off the list with a crack of the whip or by Executive fiat under the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, but that also the use of technological exhibits at annual meetings will be severely impinged upon as a source of revenue to continue the refresher education and the continuing education of its members.

I think the gentleman has contributed very much indeed, as he does regularly

on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, Dr. HALL and commend him for his forthright statement on the disastrous effects the Internal Revenue ruling may have on many worthy organizations.

As one who has long been associated with the Boy Scouts of America I am particularly concerned about what this ruling will mean to scouting. Dr. HALL has covered that area in detail, so I would just like to remind my colleagues of some of the other worthy organizations in America who will find their work seriously hampered if this tax ruling is allowed to stand.

First of all it will hit directly at every labor union in America which has a publication which accepts advertising. In addition it will affect such great organizations as the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, the American Medical Association, the National Geographic Society, the American Association of University Women, and dozens of trade, business, and professional organizations whose contribution to our national life is unlimited.

The Internal Revenue Service has clearly overstepped its authority in this instance and Congress is now in the position of protecting the free associations in this country from an unwarranted attack by the administration through the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, who is rendering such valiant service to the Congress and to the Nation. I simply want to say in response that I cannot add anything to what he has said here except to say the reason I am addressing myself particularly to the Girl Scout and the Boy Scout situation is because certainly they would not be suspect in any educational or training or cultural effort that they try to impart to the leaders of tomorrow.

My second reason is that I have had 47 years continuous registration as a Boy Scout. I am very proud of that, along with some 278 Members of this Congress. Now I am most delighted to yield to my own colleague from Missouri, a man who knows more about the Internal Revenue Service and who has served on the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am returning to the gentleman his commendation, because I am so pleased that he has taken the time to expose this problem which has been disturbing a number of us on the Ways and Means Committee.

I call attention to the great service Congressman WATTS has done in this particular area when the Internal Revenue Service first began making noises about changing what I believe is actually the law. The IRS attempted changing the law through the regulatory process instead of coming before the Ways and

Means Committee, and so in effect before the Congress, and asking for a change in the law.

It is important, as the gentleman from Missouri is pointing out here, that the Internal Revenue Service, in seeking to correct what they have identified as an abuse—and perhaps there have been abuses in this area of revenue from advertising functions affecting organizations like the Boy Scouts and the National Geographic Society and many others. In fact, all of our fine nonprofit organizations will be seriously affected. If these organizations are to fulfill their functions, they have to communicate with their membership. The way they do this to a large degree is through their in-house magazines.

I also direct attention to the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making. Whether or not the Internal Revenue Service has been motivated by the fact that some of these private nonprofit organizations, who have a legitimate concern in legislation that is before us, really have created an abuse, or whether the Internal Revenue Service is moving in to try to suppress the viewpoints of these private nonprofit organizations, and whether it is the administration using the Internal Revenue Service as a front for this purpose, the fact still remains that this indeed is going to occur.

I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, because he served with me on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, that one of the things we did not achieve in that committee is that we were unable to zero in on the executive department's lobbying with Federal funds. However, we did achieve a great deal, in my judgment, and I believe the bill we have before the House, which has passed the Senate, has a great many advancements in it.

I have said to the executive department that I would be a little more interested in the concern they have about lobbying by private nonprofit organizations, or anyone else, if there were some discipline exercised by the executive branch of Government in lobbying before the Congress. We have all experienced it. There are two criminal statutes that forbid this. Regarding these statutes I have some correspondence with the Attorney General, that I am about ready to put into the RECORD, wherein I have asked him why he was not enforcing these laws against the operations of the executive branch of the Government.

Certainly when there has been no discipline on the part of the executive, whether it relates to criminal statutes or just the exercise of good sense in not using taxpayers' money to drive through the Congress programs they are interested in, it ill behooves the departments suddenly to become very conscious about the private nonprofit organizations speaking up, as they should speak up, in behalf of their point of view in respect to legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving me the opportunity to express myself.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the contribution of my col-

league. I am glad he brought out the fact that for two and a half years we served on the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

It is germane that we were not able to get into this committee report, except under the supplemental view which the gentleman published, that the executive branch lobbying is in direct violation of existing criminal statutes.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that we should also commend our colleague, who also serves on the Ways and Means Committee along with the Honorable JOHN WATTS, of Kentucky, the Honorable JOEL BROYHILL, who has submitted legislation—indeed, as the gentleman from Missouri submitted some years ago—to preclude this use of reversing the veto powers of the executive branch?

Does the gentleman not agree with me this is the veto in reverse when, under the Administrative Procedure Act and the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President, or his Cabinet members, may publish in the Federal Register, a new rule, which has the effect of law unless one or the other body of the Congress vetoes it within 6 days?

Mr. CURTIS. It is almost that. It is even worse than that, I would say.

The gentleman pointed out the law of 1950. That was the result of rather extensive hearings in the Ways and Means Committee. I was not here at the time, but I have read the hearings. There was also testimony in the Senate Finance Committee and debate on the floor of the Senate, in an effort to resolve the difficult issue.

Let us consider the other side of the coin. We have magazines for profit, which complain about the competition of these nonprofit magazines. They have a legitimate point, but it is the responsibility of the Congress to resolve it.

Now, as the gentleman points out, the Internal Revenue Service is seeking to change the considered judgment of the Congress through regulation.

I should like to add—and I know the gentleman will be glad to hear this—that Congressman WATTS and I have both been in touch with the Internal Revenue Service, and they have assured us they will not try to put any regulation into effect without referring this back to the Congress. They should not even go so far as they are going, but at least we have this understanding.

Another interesting point is that the Administration is supposed to be sending up a tax reform bill. If this is so, why in the name of Heaven do not they include their ideas on this subject in the tax reform bill and let the Ways and Means Committee and interested Members of the House and Senate zero in on this question. If we need to change the law in some way—and perhaps we do, since it has not been looked at in 16 or 17 years—then it ought to be reviewed in a considered way that will not in any way hamper the very fine nonprofit organizations and their magazines.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. This is indeed the proper place in which this should be considered.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he believes there is any significance in the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has picked upon the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts, two organizations which have no voice except through their leaders, whereas organizations such as the Elks, the Moose, the American Legion, the VFW, and the AMVETS—organizations which might have a positive voice—have not been touched? If the Internal Revenue Service can get a rule and regulation established with respect to the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, it might be binding upon all these other organizations.

Mr. HALL. I want to make clear to the gentleman, in answer to his question, I do not believe for one moment that only the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts have been singled out by name for the application of this new rule by fiat. Actually, as I said to the gentleman from Virginia, I believe it will be applicable to about 700 organizations. Indeed, it will be decimating in its effect on these two.

As I said in the colloquy once before, I have concentrated my research on them, just as a springboard, so to speak, to bring this situation to the attention of the Nation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I would say that there are many organizations such as the ones the gentleman from Pennsylvania named, which are unaware of the fact that it is going to affect them. It will.

It will hit them, and it will hit any organization that uses a magazine as a method of communicating with its membership to the extent that they try to pay for some of the costs through advertising. We need to alert these other organizations so that they can get behind the proper consideration of this measure.

Mr. HALL. That is the whole purpose, and I appreciate the gentleman asking the question.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON].

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is to be commended for taking this time to focus the attention of the House on the proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to tax the advertising and other income on national publications by educational, scientific, and charitable organizations. Each one of us must deal with this problem within the framework of his own personal experience and relationship with the organizations that fall into the category that are now threatened with a financial obligation that might well be the first step toward the eventual destruction of our free and private institutions as we have known them.

Such rulings should be alarming to every Member of the House of Representatives. National publications by associations and nonprofit organizations

and educational institutions are designed primarily to enlighten and inspire the membership as well as provide information so members can better perform their respective duties. A first-class publication can only be achieved on a national basis because of the costs involved. Such publications then serve very important purposes in enabling an organization like the Boy Scouts of America to achieve its basic aims and purposes as outlined in its charter which was received from the Congress of the United States.

While it is not the intent here to discount the value of advertising that is provided in the subject publications by many and various commercial enterprises, it is, I am sure, recognized that money put into such advertising goes far beyond the actual value received in many cases. On the other hand, the value of such advertising should not be downgraded because it does not have real "commercial import." In many cases where there may be a doubt, the advertiser will go along because of the interest he has in the organization involved.

If a regulation as now proposed by the IRS is implemented, what then will be the attitude of these advertisers who may have some doubt as to the commercial benefits of their advertising in the publications covered by such a ruling? Perhaps never before has the need been so great for our free and private institutions that contribute to the character-building functions of the youth of America than today. These organizations should be strengthened at every turn to help them supplement the training in the home toward the building of better citizens. Rather than adopting methods which will weaken the financial structure of these organizations, we should today be engaged in a search for methods to bolster their position in our society. Every effort should be made to open avenues of voluntary financial assistance and to protect them from any movement toward direct Government subsidies. One of the greatest restricting forces of non-profit youth and educational organizations at work in the United States today is their ability to finance their operations adequately. The general exemption from taxation both on a local and Federal level is of great help in enabling an organization to exist in these financially hazardous times.

If the ruling now under study becomes a reality, what would be the next step? How long before local governments who are seeking new sources of revenue and badly in need of additional finances would attempt to tax Boy Scout, Girl Scout, YMCA camps, and so forth, and other properties that are currently a vital part of their operations. I am seriously concerned today as an individual who has devoted many hours of voluntary service and time in the Boy Scouts of America and other youth and adult nonprofit and charitable organizations, and in this concern urge every Member of the Congress of the United States to use his influence to protect the position of these organizations from the imposition of any additional financial burden

as a result of the proposal of the Internal Revenue Service.

Today is the day for action for the preservation of our free and private institutions that have contributed to the greatness of America. We cannot permit any encroachment whatever upon their ability to continue in the character-building functions that have been so effective in the past.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I again view with alarm the policy decision by the Treasury Department relative to new taxes for certain nonprofit organizations. Once again the independent sector of our economy is being penalized. These organizations have served the public welfare by increasing knowledge through extensive research, travel, and studies. They publish publications serving the public interest and all of the people will be handicapped, if the new regulations are not rescinded.

As pointed out already by others, this decision by the Treasury Department could unfairly penalize and handicap great and worthwhile movements.

Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of this public service offered by the independent sector and others already mentioned, I cite the marvelous record of the National Geographic Society. This organization has for over three-quarters of a century had the wondrous task of gathering and diffusing geographic knowledge.

The society shares its growing store of geographic fact with countless millions through its world-famous National Geographic magazine, 24 million color maps a year, its globes, atlases, books, monographs, lectures, bulletins for schools, and its information service for press, television, and radio.

Mr. Speaker, to the young in heart of every age there is magic in the name National Geographic. The very words conjure up images of distant places, of explorers and scientists, sparkling seas and dazzling mountain peaks, strange plants, animals, people, and customs.

Not surprisingly, many of the society's over 4 million members throughout the world regard the organization as a personal friend. A boy of 8 wrote this letter:

Some other boys and I were thinking about going to Africa to explore. We haven't got very much money in the bank, so we would like very much if the National Geographic would like to send us. I was thinking of going when we are 21 year's old that would be 13 year's from now thank you very much.

An elderly lady came into the society's headquarters in Washington, D.C., to thank the National Geographic for accepting her as a member. She said in all seriousness:

But I am afraid that at my age I shall not be able to go off on all those expeditions.

Since 1888, when the society was

formed, it has supported more than 200 major expeditions and scientific projects.

For exploration is the essence of geography. Geography is not static, and the study of it merely begins with the configurations and dimensions of the earth's features. This conception is rightly embodied in today's dictionary definition of "geography":

The science of the earth and its life; especially the description of land, sea, air and the distribution of plant and animal life, including man and his industries, with reference to the mutual relations of these diverse elements.

Mr. Speaker, I can also present testimony to some of the contributions that have been made by the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, which I head. This was done with the invaluable help and encouragement of the National Geographic Society.

The U.S. Capitol Historical Society is an educational organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. Its membership is open to everyone in the United States who wishes to help the society foster an informed understanding of the inspiration and promise of American history.

The society was founded by a group of devoted, dedicated Americans, in and out of the Congress, who believe that the thrill they derive from the story of the United States can best be communicated and the greatest sense of drama and conviction conveyed, if the Capitol edifice itself were made the focus of the society's program.

Within the walls of this building a free people has expressed its collective will in terms of legislation that has shaken the world. Here we have advanced man's march toward individual dignity and material well-being. With our publications we are trying to tell the story of the United States of America.

The very select group from the National Geographic Society who deserve special attention and for whom I shall never be able to speak as eloquently as I would like and to whom I and the Capitol Historical Society already owe an everlasting gratitude include, Melville Bell Grosvenor, president and editor; Melvin M. Payne, executive vice president and secretary; Lonnelle Aikman, the principal author of "We, the People"; Jules Billard, editorial director for our book; Robert Breeden, design and production director for this publication; James R. Whitney, director of printing and engraving for the book on the Capitol; and George F. Mobley, the chief photographer.

Mr. Speaker, I now present a summary statement of the National Geographic Society's contribution to our own society, the White House Historical Association, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association and the Washington National Monument Association. In addition, I have a summary statement on some of the other worthwhile contributions made by the National Geographic Society. All of these services are now available to every department of Government and the public and would be curtailed or eliminated if the Treasury Department decision is allowed to stand without

amendment. I also want to state I am not against equitable and favorable taxation in every part of our economy, but I do think these decisions should be made after public hearings are held. It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee would find time to hold hearings and hear testimony on how their decision affects the many philanthropic and volunteer movements.

The material referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM OF PUBLIC SERVICE GRANTS IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLICATION OF EDUCATIONAL BOOKS ON THE WHITE HOUSE, THE CAPITOL, THE SUPREME COURT, AND THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

White House Historical Association:

Editorial labor 1962-66 in connection with preparation of "White House" book, "Living White House," and "Presidents" book.....	\$182,335.28
Engraving costs on "White House" book, 1962.....	78,731.74

Total direct contribution	261,067.02
---------------------------------	------------

Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made and repaid in 1963....	100,000.00
--	------------

U.S. Capitol Historical Society:

Cash contribution, 1963-62....	10,000.00
Editorial labor, in connection with preparation of "We, The People" book, 1963-1966	74,617.07
Office space donated December 1963 to March 1967.....	24,375.00

Total direct contributions	108,992.07
----------------------------------	------------

Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made in 1963, repaid in 1964	211,397.58
---	------------

Foundation of the Federal Bar Association:

Editorial labor in year 1965 in connection with preparation of "Equal Justice Under Law," Supreme Court book.....	95,301.08
---	-----------

Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made in 1965.....	180,353.05
Less amount repaid to date...	30,386.43

Balance still unpaid.....	149,966.62
---------------------------	------------

Washington National Monument Association:

Editorial labor in 1965 in connection with preparation "Washington: Man & Monument"	31,007.52
---	-----------

Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital to pay cost of book in 1965....	130,000.00
Less amount repaid to date...	32,834.00

Balance still unpaid.....	97,166.00
---------------------------	-----------

PUBLIC SERVICE BOOKS PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY

Late in 1961 the White House Historical Association requested the assistance and guidance of the Society in preparing an official guidebook, the first in the 1962-year history of the Executive Mansion of the White House. Mrs. John F. Kennedy had organized the Association to "enhance understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the Executive Mansion."

The Society pledged its cooperation as a public service and offered the full resources of its staff—editors, photographers, artists and others to prepare the book. On July 4, 1962, little more than six months after the initial request, the book entitled, "The White House," An Historic Guide, became available to White House visitors and, by mail to all the American people through the office of the White House Historical Association.

To produce the 132-page, lavishly illustrated book on the history, the great state rooms, and the furnishings of the White House, the Society's staff devoted more than 6,000 hours of work. The Society also contributed the cost of all photographic materials and printing plates to the Association.

Within a few months the first printing of 250,000 copies was depleted, and the Society prepared a second edition of 100,000 copies which was also sold out by mid-December 1962. By then the Society's combined contribution of editorial assistance and printing plates totaled \$121,000. Because the Society assumed so much of the costs, the Association was able to offer the book for the nominal price of \$1 for the paper back edition.

Each year the Society's staff has revised the White House Guidebook, making timely additions in pictures and text to reflect the changing White House. The third edition of 250,000 copies prepared by the Society in late 1962 brought the total number printed in the book's first year of publication to 600,000 copies.

A fourth edition of half a million copies followed in May 1963. The Society's staff devoted 1,600 hours to this new edition of the book and increased its size from 132 pages to 144.

As a further public service the Society gave major cooperation in producing "We, the People," The Story of the United States Capitol, for the U.S. Capitol Historical Society. Once again editors, writers, photographers, artists—a complete staff—worked with the Historical Society to produce a 144-page, color illustrated book on the nation's Capitol. By December 5, 1963, when the book was published, staff members had worked 9,334 hours to prepare it. The paper back edition of "We, the People" became available to the thousands of visitors to the Capitol for \$1 a copy, a price which would not have been possible if it had not been for the generous contribution of the National Geographic.

The book offered visitors and students an illustrated history of the Capitol and a description of how the legislative branch of the government functions. Among its historic and valuable pictures was the first official photograph of the United States Senate.

Like the White House book before it, "We, the People" became an immediate best seller and the first edition of 250,000 copies was exhausted by the spring of 1964 when the Society prepared a second edition of 440,000 copies, revising and updating text material and photographs.

That same year the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library Committee requested the Society's assistance in preparing a booklet for the many Americans who saw a traveling exhibit of memorabilia of the late President. The Society responded as it had for the previous public service efforts. It produced a 16-page, fully illustrated booklet which helped secure public funds for the memorial to President Kennedy. The booklet, several times reprinted, reached a total of almost two million copies. The Society's contribution: more than 400 hours of staff time—a total cost of \$3,072.

The Geographic produced a second book for the White House Historical Association, "The Presidents of the United States of America." A first edition of half a million copies went on sale in November 1964 for 50¢ in the paper back version. The 80-page book contained one-page biographies of each President opposite a color reproduction of the chief executive's official White House por-

trait. This book had come as a suggestion from President and Mrs. Kennedy at the time the Society was asked to produce the White House Guidebook, and research, production and planning started at that time. In all more than 2,500 hours of staff time went into the book—a contribution of some \$18,000.

Shortly after the publication of the book on the Presidents, the same staff produced the fifth edition of the popular White House Guidebook, bringing the total number of books published to 1,705,000. The new edition was expanded to 152 pages. More than 1,500 hours went into the fifth edition, and the Society's cost in producing it amounted to \$10,857.

The Washington National Monument Association also turned to the Society for aid in the publication of a long-planned book about George Washington and the Washington Monument. And again as a public service the Society's staff wrote and illustrated a 72-page biography of the first President and history of the Monument. Because of the Society's contribution of almost 5,000 hours of staff time which amounted to some \$31,000, the book was made available to visitors to the Washington Monument and Mount Vernon for only 50¢. The first edition of 500,000 copies went on sale July 4, 1965.

Within a few weeks the Society's staff completed work on the fifth major public service book, "Equal Justice Under Law," the first illustrated history of the Supreme Court and its principal cases. In so doing, the Society had produced books on the three branches of government—legislative, executive and judicial.

The Supreme Court book came at the request of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association. Society employees devoted almost 16,000 hours to the preparation and production of the book—equal to \$95,301.

The 144-page book with 268 illustrations, many of them in color, is available to visitors at the Court for \$1 in the paper back edition. The Society produced a first edition of 100,000 copies and a second of 150,000 copies, updating the book and making changes brought about by the resignation of Justice Goldberg and the appointment of Justice Fortas.

With the continuing popularity of "We, the People," the U.S. Capitol Historical Society requested another edition in 1965, and the Geographic staff once again revised the book producing a third edition of 350,000 copies for a total printing of 1,050,000 copies.

In 1966, the Society produced "The Living White House," its sixth public service book, which had been in progress since the spring of 1965. In preparing the book for the White House Historical Association, the Society again contributed all writing, editing, photography, layout, quality control and other supporting editorial operations as a public service. Its staff members worked more than 17,000 hours on the book which was published in November in a quantity of 250,000 copies.

This book, a companion to the earlier White House Guide, shows the White House as a home, and tells of each family to live there since John Adams. Like the first White House book, it is profusely illustrated, and has been made available in a paper back edition for the modest price of \$1.

The Society also prepared more new editions of public service books in 1966. The White House Guidebook was increased from 152 to 156 pages and required some 1,300 hours of staff time. The publication of 120,000 copies raised the total number printed to 1,825,000. "We, the People" went into its fourth edition of 400,000 copies for a total of 1,450,000 in all editions. The Geographic's contribution on this edition was almost 600 hours.

And this year the Society is once again working on new editions of these two popular books, a service from which all America benefits.

NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY COOPERATION WITH U.S. GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES—1966

During 1966, as has been the case since the Society's founding in 1888, the National Geographic Society continued its close working relationship with the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as well as with many semipublic organizations affiliated with and/or furthering the objectives of the Government.

A broad basis of cooperation arises directly from the composition of the Society's Board of Trustees and its Committee for Research and Exploration.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Of the Society's Board membership of 24, 10 were in active or retired Government service during 1966. They are Dr. Leonard Carmichael, retired Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Rear Admiral Leo O. Colbert, formerly Director of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey; Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, USN (ret.); General Curtis E. LeMay, USAF (ret.), formerly Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force; Dr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Dr. James H. Wakelin, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development; Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States; Dr. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Dr. Alexander Wetmore, former Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; and Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, former Director of the National Park Service.

COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH AND EXPLORATION

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, retired Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, serves the Society on a full-time basis as Vice President for Research and Exploration and Chairman of the Committee for Research and Exploration. Dr. Alexander Wetmore, also a former Secretary of the Smithsonian, serves as Vice Chairman of this Committee. Other Trustees with Government affiliation serving on the Committee during 1966 were Admiral Colbert, Admiral Land, Dr. Wakelin, and Dr. Wirth. In addition, the following eminent scientists of the Smithsonian Institution are members of the Research Committee: Dr. A. Remington Kellogg, Research Associate and former Director, U.S. National Museum; Dr. T. Dale Stewart, Senior Scientist, Office of Anthropology; and Dr. Matthew W. Stirling, Research Associate and former Director, Bureau of American Ethnology. Thus, of the full Committee of 19, there were 9 who hold or have held positions of responsibility in the Federal Government.

The Chairman of this Committee, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, has been consulted by many Federal agencies and departments concerning scientific and exploration matters. Further, he continues to serve as Chairman of the National Selective Service Scientific Advisory Group.

Other examples of cooperation between this Committee and the Government appear in the following summary of research cosponsored with Federal agencies:

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN COOPERATION WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Elsewhere in this Information Return is a comprehensive report on the Society's program of scientific research during 1966. Of the 49 grants listed, there were 15 in support of projects either cosponsored by a Federal agency or the Scientific Leader of which was associated with the Government. Briefly, they are as follows:

- (1) Expedition to recover meteorites in Saudi Arabia by Dr. Kurt Frederiksson, Curator of Meteorites, Smithsonian Institution.
- (2) Study of Seabird Colonies in the Islands of the Aegean Sea by Dr. George E. Watson, Acting Curator of Birds, Smithsonian Institution.
- (3) Study of Biology of Deep Sea Fauna by

Institute of Marine Science, University of Miami, in collaboration with National Science Foundation.

(4) Archeological Project at Dzibilchaltun, Mexico, by Tulane University in cooperation with National Science Foundation.

(5) Publication research on Russell Cave, Alabama, by Carl F. Miller of the Smithsonian Institution. In addition to supporting scientific research on this archeological site, the Society donated the cave to the National Park Service, which has included it in the National Parks and Monuments System.

(6) Ecological Studies of Fresh-water Turtle in Panama by Dr. John M. Legler of University of Utah in cooperation with the National Science Foundation.

(7) Mapping of Mt. Hubbard-Mt. Kennedy area, Alaska-Yukon border, in cooperation with the Air Force, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

(8) Archeological survey of deep water shipwrecks off Bermuda by Mendel L. Peterson, Chairman, Department of Armed Forces History, Smithsonian Institution.

(9) Ecological study of the Florida Everglades by Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Sr., in cooperation with the National Park Service.

(10) Continued biotelemetry research on grizzly bears and other large mammals by Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr., and Dr. John Craighead in collaboration with the National Science Foundation, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department, and the State of Montana.

(11) Icefield Ranges Research Project in the St. Elias Mountains, Yukon Territory, conducted by the Arctic Institute of North America, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey.

(12) Alaskan Glacier Study carried out by the Glaciological Institute of Michigan State University, in collaboration with the National Science Foundation.

(13) American Antarctic Mountaineering Expedition of the American Alpine Club. Exploration of a little known area of Antarctica carried out with the support of the Navy and the National Science Foundation.

(14) Study of the Comparative Ecology and Behavior of Tropical Storks in East Africa, Ethiopia, India, and Ceylon by Dr. M. Philip Kahl, Post-Doctoral Fellow of the National Science Foundation.

(15) Physiological study of the Gray Whale off Baja California, Mexico, by the Virginia Mason Research Center with support from the National Institutes of Health, and Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In keeping with the Nation's policy of international cooperation, the Society either collaborated with or made direct grants in support of scientific programs of several foreign governments. Examples are the Early Man studies of Dr. L. S. B. Leakey of the National Museum in Nairobi, Kenya; the chimpanzee research in the Gombe Stream Reserve of Tanzania in cooperation with that country's government, and a donation to Tanzania for acquisition of the area so that it can be included in their National Parks System; continued support of the oceanographic and environmental studies of Captain Jacques-Yves Cousteau in cooperation with the governments of France and Monaco; cooperation with the Turkish authorities in archeological programs in Aphrodisias, Turkey; with the Jordan government in archaeological studies in Jerusalem; and with the government of Greece in a search for the ruins of ancient Helice. The Vice Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Melvin M. Payne, continues to serve on the Advisory Board of the Ngorongoro Conservation Unit of Tanzania.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: NAVY

In the February 1966 National Geographic appeared an article on the "Water War in Viet Nam." Although of interest to all the Armed Forces, it told particularly the story of the Navy and Marine Corps and their efforts

in this aspect of the war. General Wallace M. Greene, Commandant of the Marine Corps, noted that "... the text and photos on the water provide an excellent documentation of one facet in our effort in Viet Nam," while the Assistant Director of Naval History thought it "informative, inspiring and deeply moving."

The Society donated more than 200 Magazines, books, Atlases, and School Bulletins to the Public Affairs Officer of the Sixth Fleet to be presented by the Navy to the Tobruk (Libya) Public Library, as a part of "Project Handclasp." The monetary value of this gift was nearly \$400, but the good will engendered is far more meaningful. In the words of Rear Admiral H. L. Miller, Chief of Information of the U.S. Navy, "... such friendly gestures on the part of your organization and our nation will win many friends in the city of Tobruk as well as in the country of Libya."

As in the case with many departments of the Federal Government, the Navy found National Geographic maps important tools in its programs and during 1966 acquired, at special rates, nearly 9,300 of them.

The Society extends its resources to all agencies of the Federal Government, and during 1966 the Navy took advantage of this spirit of cooperation by making extensive use of the Society's photographic files. The Marine Corps on three different occasions requested and promptly received 21 duplicate color slides on each occasion, for research and official lectures on Viet Nam. In the words of the Marine Corps Liaison Officer to the Center for Special Warfare, these photographs "would render a tangible and positive aid in familiarizing military personnel enroute to Viet Nam with the status of amphibious operations there."

The Bureau of Yards and Docks was given five slides for official lectures on Viet Nam, and another five 4x5 transparencies for presentations. An enlarged color print of the USS Skate at the North Pole was donated to that ship. The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations was supplied with three photographs and internegatives of Viet Nam scenes for display and later framing and presentation to the new escort destroyer, USS Meyerkord, named in honor of a hero of the war. The U.S. Naval Amphibious School was given complete duplicate color slides of illustrations from two articles on Viet Nam, "Helicopter War in South Viet Nam" and "Water War in Viet Nam", for training purposes. The USS Monticello was presented with complimentary copies of the September 1966 National Geographic containing an article on Jefferson's Monticello, for which the ship was named, as well as color prints of a photograph of Monticello. The USS Fechteler was given two enlarged color prints. Marine Corps Headquarters was given a transparency of Abu Simbel in Egypt for historical reference. Five prints went to the Interagency Committee on Oceanography for use in its publication on "Opportunities in Oceanography."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: ARMY

The Army Map Service is routinely notified of all new maps published by the Society and all up-dated reprints of old maps in advance of release date. That they are pertinent and valuable in the Army's programs is obvious from the fact that the Department of the Army purchased during 1966, at special rates, more than 31,000 National Geographic maps, globes, and Atlases. In addition, the Society supplied 32,500 reprints of old maps, specially reprinted and made available at special rates to the Government Printing Office for use in the preparation of further volumes on the History of World War II.

The Society freely cooperates in making its photographic facilities, knowledge and files available to the Army. During 1966, for instance, five photographers from the Army

Digest spent an entire day in the Society's offices and laboratories receiving detailed briefings on how the National Geographic handles photographs from the time they are received until they are edited and put into magazine dummy form. Eight prints from the "Water War in Viet Nam" article were provided without charge to the Development Engineering Division at the Aberdeen Proving Ground for research purposes; 2 prints of the Amundsen-Scott station in Antarctica went to the Army Map Service; 63 black and white prints and 14 duplicate color transparencies to the U.S. Army Intelligence School at Fort Holabird; two pictures to the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, for inclusion in official courses. The Army Night Vision Laboratories at Fort Belvoir was given a selection of 75 slides on laser experiments for scientific study and analysis. Half a dozen to the Command Conference Room. Permission was given to the U.S. Military Academy to reproduce a National Geographic article on Russia in their text on Soviet Geography, and to reproduce a series of valuable paintings for a lecture on "Ancient Mexico" to the Academy's students in Spanish.

The Society's Lecture Division assisted the Army Special Warfare School in preparing an audio-visual demonstration for a special Army Convention by providing assistance and equipment. The Assistant Commandant acknowledged the value of this aid by writing, "The professional and technical advice and assistance provided for the audio-script narration, together with the loan of electronic equipment, resulted in an outstanding demonstration, and reflected most favorably on the Special Warfare School and the United States Army. Without your vital contribution, we could not have achieved the high standards desired for the AUSA Convention."

A supply of the Society's new map of Viet Nam was donated to General W. C. Westmoreland, Commander of the Army Forces in that country and he noted that they would be "put to good use" in our country's effort there.

The Society also gave General of the Army Mark W. Clark, USA (Ret.), rare, out-of-print maps to be used in connection with his official papers.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: AIR FORCE

The Air Force is one of many Government agencies which makes extensive use of National Geographic maps and during 1966 it was supplied with nearly 23,000 maps, Atlases and globes at special rates, which are considerably lower than those offered to the public.

As it has for many years, the Society's Photographic Division cooperated with the annual photographic flying shortcourse, covering a coast-to-coast schedule in nine days. Director of Photography Robert E. Gilka was co-director of the course and Mr. W. E. Garrett, Assistant Illustrations Editor, was a member of the faculty. In addition the Society supplied projection equipment for use at each of the sessions.

The Air Force also took advantage of the Society's liberal policy of assisting the Government through providing photographs of key areas for official purposes and/or giving permission for reproduction of National Geographic material where appropriate—all, of course, without any cost to the Government.

Examples are an enlarged photographic print of a "Surface of the Sun" painting for use in a brochure on the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories; permission for the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center to photograph the Society's unique 11-foot World Globe in its headquarters building, the resulting continuous-strip photography of the earth to be used in the Apollo space program; 2 Kodachromes to the Air Intelli-

gence Training Center; a copy of a "Flying Arsenal" illustration to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base; 57 duplicate transparencies to the United States Strike Command Headquarters for briefing; another to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces for lectures; 3 color prints for display to the 48th Tactical Fighter Wing; a collection of photographs on hurricanes to the USAF Weather Research Squadron.

One hundred reprints of a National Geographic article on the Air Force were donated to this Department.

The Society also expressed its willingness to assist the Air Force Academy by donating up-to-date maps for its library.

Mr. Luis Marden, veteran of the Society's Foreign Editorial Staff, spent several hours giving detailed information on Pitcairn Island to representatives of the Air Force.

As a further example of the Society's interest in and cooperation with the Air Force, the Society's Committee for Research and Exploration administers the General Thomas D. White, United States Air Force Space Trophy, established by Chairman of the Board Thomas W. McKnew in 1961, to be awarded annually to the military or civil service member of the Air Force who has made the most outstanding contribution to the Nation's progress in aerospace during the year. In 1966 the award (for 1965) was presented to Lt. Col. Edward H. White II for his outstanding contributions to the U.S. exploration of space by becoming the first self-propelled human in outer space. The presentation was made at a ceremony held at the National Geographic's headquarters by Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Harold Brown.

Another contribution by the Society both to education and to the Air Force is represented by the establishment in 1960 of the John Oliver LaGorce Award, named in honor of the Society's late, distinguished President. The award is made annually to the outstanding cadet at the Air Force Academy in the field of geography. In addition to the honor, the award carries with it a Life Membership in the National Geographic Society and a silver card tray.

Still another National Geographic award signifies the long standing spirit of cooperation between the Society and the Air Force. In 1966 the Society established the General Orvil A. Anderson Memorial Award, to be awarded annually by the Society to an Air War College Student excelling in politico-military strategy. This is in recognition of the late General Anderson's outstanding achievement as Pilot of the Stratosphere Balloon Explorer II, which reached a world's altitude record of 72,395 feet on November 11, 1935, during a joint Society-Air Corps project. The recipient of this award is given a Life Membership in the National Geographic Society, and the award is also commemorated by a handsome plaque which is permanently positioned in the main auditorium of the College. The Commandant of the Air War College expressed the gratitude of the Air Force for this recognition by stating "The Air War College is most grateful for this continuing memorial to General Anderson, and our selection for this award will be in conformance with the high ideals you have established."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: GENERAL

Other branches of the Defense Department received assistance from the Society, as follows:

Industrial College of the Armed Forces was given permission to reproduce the Society's map of South Viet Nam in the form of a Vugraph for use in a lecture presented by the National Security Seminar.

Illustrations from an article on treasure off the Florida coast were provided for publication in "Stars and Stripes."

Arrangements have been made to make the Society's television films available to the

Armed Services overseas upon request from the Government.

The Society has cooperated fully with Civil Defense, first by providing one of the finest fall-out shelters in the Metropolitan Washington area and secondly by conducting several morning-long classes.

Complimentary photographs were provided the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (5); Industrial College of the Armed Forces (9 transparencies) and four on another occasion.

The Department of Defense made frequent use of the Society's photographic collection, with free access given to their liaison officers. On 21 different occasions during 1966, their representatives made selections of photographs of critical world areas needed for study purposes, and a total of 742, many of them color prints, were promptly supplied without charge to this Agency.

Their Liaison Officer expressed the official appreciation of the Agency in a letter stating, "Our office is most grateful to members of the Illustrations Library and the photo lab for supplying these prints on such short notice. It is believed that no other organization in the Washington area had the capability to respond so quickly and competently for this type of information."

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A Geographic map cabinet was donated to the Secret Service.

The Internal Revenue Service was given an enlarged color print for display purposes.

Savings Bond Division. The Society continued its long standing cooperation with the Government's Savings Bond program by providing a convenient payroll deduction plan for employees purchasing Bonds.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Throughout its history, the Society has maintained close liaison with the Interior Department. Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane and National Park Service Director Stephen T. Mather served on the Society's Board of Trustees in the early part of this century. This association continues in the person of Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, member of the Board of Trustees and former Director of the Park Service. Dr. Wirth is Secretary of the NPS Advisory Board on National Parks and Historic Sites established by Congress in 1935, and the Society's President, Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, also serves on this Board.

Other specific examples of assistance to the Department of Interior follow:

Office of the Secretary and miscellaneous bureaus

The Society supported publication of Interior's "Conservation Yearbook" by providing a comprehensive selection of illustrations. NGS staff spent some 30 hours on this project.

The Bureau of Mines was provided with a photograph for official purposes; the Bureau of Indian Affairs with five, for reproduction in literature on Indian Affairs; the U.S. Park Police with 15 color transparencies for training purposes; six to the Geological Survey for projection in connection with lectures on Midway Island; and 39 were given to the Public Information Officer, Secretary of Interior, for booklets in the State Resource Series on South Dakota and Maryland.

The Society donated 40,000 copies of current issues of its School Bulletin to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to assist in educational programs of the Assistant Commissioner for Education.

The Society further cooperated with Interior by lending it a collection of wildlife paintings by staff artist and naturalist Walter A. Weber for exhibit at the Interior building. In addition, the Society provided frames and also prepared literature and invitations in connection with the exhibit.

Valuable advice was given to a representative of the Secretary's office on the prepara-

tion of an illustrated book on President Johnson's visit to Samoa.

National Park Service

As noted earlier in this report, the Society continued in 1966 its close cooperation with the National Park Service, Department of Interior, in programs of scientific research and conservation with grants in support of studies at Russell Cave National Monument, Florida Everglades, and Yellowstone National Park.

The Society made a Public Service contribution of \$4,500 to the National Park Service Donations Account to be used by the Director of the Park Service in furtherance of its objectives.

Of great interest to the National Park Service were the Society's revised book on the National Parks, "America's Wonderlands," and comprehensive articles on the Parks in the July 1966 National Geographic by former Director Conrad L. Wirth and present Director George B. Hartzog, Jr.

Included with the articles was a new map on this country's "Vacationlands."

The Society also published in its official journal another article of interest to the Park Service, "Mr. Jefferson's Monticello."

That the articles and map were successful in their goal of telling the story of America and its great resources under the protection of the National Park Service is evident in these typical comments:

"I came to the realization that no matter how far a person may travel outside of the United States, no country can offer the beauty or peaceful serenity available to the American people through our National Park System."

"Thanks to the National Geographic we had a most wonderful holiday visiting Yellowstone Park, National Teton Park, . . . and some other places which had caught our imagination through your articles."

"The two articles on Our National Parks are superb."

From a fighting man in Viet Nam: "We have found your July issue most comforting. The beautiful pictures of all the National Parks . . . were a pleasant memory of what is still and will always be the United States we love and miss so deeply."

"The Geographic has come up with as fine a sketch of the purpose and scope of our National Parks as has ever been presented . . ."

"We found your 'Vacationlands of the United States and Canada' map invaluable as a basic reference."

"The map fills the need for all travelling people in the USA."

"Your Vacationlands map is a great idea, well carried out. We've already written to several suggested places for information . . ."

"I have never before seen such a beautiful and comprehensive map of all the wonderful places to see in our country."

"Your article 'Mr. Jefferson's Monticello' is very informative and enjoyable."

"The article (on Monticello) provided me with much information which I had never heard of before."

The National Geographic School Bulletin also gave editorial support to the National Park Service and other branches of the Department of Interior, with 12 articles in its 30 issues during the school year on such subjects as Friendly Ghost Town, Elk in Redwood Wilderness, Great Sand Dunes National Monument, Canyonlands, National Key Deer Refuge, Key West Refuges, Everglades National Park, Olympic National Park, Statue of Liberty, Washington National Zoo, Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, Mt. Rainier National Park, Buck Island Reef National Monument, National Wilderness Preservation System, Redwood National Park, Superstition Mountains, 50th Anniversary of Park Service, Forest Service, and National Christmas Tree.

The National Park Service is entrusted with preservation of the White House and

therefore appreciates the assistance given by the Society to the White House Historical Association, as is noted fully later in this report. It is also appreciative of assistance given to the National Parks and Recreation Association, which was provided with rent-free office space valued at \$3,456 during 1966.

There are many other examples of cooperation during 1966: The Geographic Art Department provided three pieces of copy for reproduction in a new NPS folder on Canyonlands National Park; the Society's Photographic Department gave extensive coverage to a convention of the National Recreation and Park Association at the request of that group; the new Vacationlands map, discussed earlier, was offered to the National Park Service's concessionaires at greatly reduced prices; 20 National Geographic books were given to the Park Service in connection with a meeting of its Advisory Board; 500 copies of a reprint of National Parks articles and Vacationlands map were donated to NPS and another 1,000 to the Congress; 8 color transparencies of Buck Island Reef National Monument were donated for a Park Service publication on that Monument; color enlargements of seven paintings were given to the Park Service in St. Augustine, Florida, for display in Park Service centers; a "Kiva Life" painting was made available for reproduction in a self-guiding trail leaflet given to visitors to Chaco Canyon National Monument; 12 slides for a program on the 50th Anniversary observance of NPS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

At the request of the State Department an extensive tour of the Society's Cartographic and Geographic Art Departments was arranged for the Soviet delegation of the Exchange Agreement in Cartography. This was sponsored jointly by State and the Coast & Geodetic Survey. The Society also cooperated with The Geographer, Department of State, by providing without charge maps for visitors to the International Geographic Union Commission on Applied Geography.

Three National Geographic World Globes were donated to the Office of Protocol to be given to Heads of State in connection with the attendance of the Secretary of State at the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization Conference in Australia. Two sets of 42 color transparencies each of scenes from Saudi Arabia were given to the Audio-Visual Services of State in connection with a visit by King Faisal. An enlarged color print of a photograph of Tripoli was supplied to our Embassy there for display purposes. Five color transparencies of Burma were donated for an exhibit in the Diplomatic Lobby of the State Department in honor of the State Visit of General Ne Win of Burma. A print of the Nile Delta was given to State for the Country Director for the United Arab Republic.

Our Embassies and Consulates overseas are supplied with complimentary subscriptions to the National Geographic (some 200, having a normal value of nearly \$2,000), as a gesture of international good will, the Society also provides complimentary subscriptions to 93 foreign embassies located in Washington.

PEACE CORPS

Peace Corps Missions throughout the world (49 of them) are supplied with complimentary subscriptions to the National Geographic.

Sixty copies of the Magazine were contributed to the Peace Corps Mission in Ecuador to assist in its educational program in that country.

The Peace Corps, too, had the benefit of use of the Society's photographic materials. The Society contributed 10 black and white negatives and 24 color transparencies of Micronesia for Peace Corps recruitment pamphlets and posters in that area of the world. That this cooperation was valuable is evident in

this quotation from the Peace Corps Regional Director for the Far East:

"It (recruiting program) has been an unprecedented success with more than 3,000 young Americans applying for the program in Micronesia. Our recruiting effort was based largely upon the photographs supplied to us by National Geographic. Without them we just would not have got off the ground."

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Society has always cooperated closely with NASA in its significant scientific aerospace programs in which the Government, the public, and indeed the entire world have a tremendous interest.

Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the first Deputy Administrator of NASA, was a member of the Society's Board of Trustees, Executive Committee and Research Committee for many years. After his death in 1965, his place on the Board of Trustees was taken by Dr. James E. Webb, now Administrator of this Agency.

The Society's Photographic Department continued its support through the loan of staff photographer Otis Imboden to cover manned launches for NASA. He also does other photographic and liaison work for NASA at other times, and the result is that he spent about half his time during 1966 working for NASA.

This Department also loaned NASA a great deal of complex and scarce equipment in 1966.

The Society's Geographic Art Department assisted NASA by making available to one of its Apollo suppliers 13 color slides of paintings prepared for "Footprints on the Moon" (March 1964 National Geographic) for use in presentation at aeronautical society lectures.

A Public Service Grant of \$5,400 was made to the Hugh L. Dryden Memorial Fund in honor of the late Deputy Administrator of NASA, in cooperation with the National Academy of Science.

From its picture files the Society provided NASA with film positives for the Surveyor Moon Program; a black and white print of the astronauts for use in NASA publications; photographs for a series of exhibits on the Gemini space program; negatives for reproduction of Gemini orbit diagrams for further exhibits; a set of color conversion film positives of moon pictures from the October 1966 National Geographic for publication in an official 3-volume set of Surveyor moon pictures; and six black and white prints and seven color transparencies for a science briefing for the Administrator of NASA. A physiographic map of the world was donated to NASA for astronaut briefings. National Geographic motion pictures were loaned for showing to NASA officials and scientists. An enlarged color print of a hurricane scene was donated to the Cape Kennedy Space Center Headquarters.

Editorially, the National Geographic Magazine reported NASA's efforts with three articles on their programs: "Space Rendezvous, Milestone on the Way to the Moon" (April); "First Color Photographs on the Moon's Rocky Face" (October); and "New Knowledge of Earth from Astronaut Photographs" by NASA scientist Paul D. Lowman, Jr., in November.

The effectiveness of these articles is demonstrated in a letter from a Professor of Aerospace Studies: "You are to be complimented for your excellent research and outstanding contributions to geographic and scientific knowledge." "The photos (in 'Earth from Orbit') were most fascinating and the narrative was exceptionally informative. . . I would like to use this article for instructional purposes. . ."

The articles in October and November were of such particular interest to NASA that they obtained at cost 25,000 reprints of the former and 20,000 of the latter. It is interesting to note that NASA finds National Geographic

articles on its programs of such importance in furthering the Agency's official aims that they have obtained reprints of nine articles on NASA projects since 1960, totalling more than 450,000 copies.

The National Geographic School Bulletin also lent editorial airing with six articles on space programs during the year.

In addition, the Society's News Service issued nine comprehensive news bulletins on NASA projects to news media all over the world, giving the broadest possible coverage to the Agency's official activities.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

During 1966 the Society continued its policy of extensive cooperation with the U.S. Information Agency and Voice of America in furthering their important mission of disseminating accurate information about the United States to the peoples of the world.

All of the following were promptly and gladly given without charge:

Four color duplicates of paintings for publication in Topic, a USIA periodical; eight pictures of Saudi Arabian scenes for publication in Al-Hayat, a magazine distributed by USIA in that country; cooperation in USIA's efforts on the U.S. exhibit at the Canadian "Expo 67"; 1 print for Al-Hayat; instruction on photographic processing, print making and extensive tours of the Society's laboratories for the chief photographic officer for USIA in Vienna; permission to use the article "What Was a Woman Doing There?" dealing with the war in Viet Nam in Voice of America broadcasts; 7 color transparencies for the U.S. exhibit at the Canadian World Exhibition; five color transparencies for use in a balloon story in America Illustrated; an additional transparency for another story in America Illustrated; and again three pictures for this periodical; and subsequently three more 4 x 5 duplicates on the Southwest for reproduction in America Illustrated; 10 color pictures on the National Parks for a television series to be produced by USIA for Middle Eastern countries; nine color pictures and two black and white prints for display at an International Asian Trade Fair in Bangkok; a print from original artwork "America's Evolving Spacecraft" for use with informational packets distributed at a New Delhi exhibit on space; two color duplicates for a USIA show on helicopters; a 4 x 5 color transparency of Yuma Valley for use in the "America's Fifty States" series; another transparency for publication in Al-Hayat and later two more for this purpose.

The Agency makes extensive use of the Society's News Bulletins on timely geographic and scientific topics and they are sent without charge, at their request, to 10 departments of USIA. National Geographic maps published during 1966 were freely offered to these departments for background information. The Society's News Service cooperated further with USIA by fulfilling countless requests for information. They also supplied USIA with various illustrations, bird call records for VOA overseas programs, a special feature for the Ceylon newspaper Colombo Observer, additional maps, news releases, and other NGS material, and also arranged for USIA coverage of a visit to National Geographic headquarters of Members of the Parliament of Tanzania who were touring the United States.

The Society's Photographic Department frequently lends its expert assistance to the USIA photographic laboratory.

The value of the Society's many contributions to USIA is typified in this letter from the Project Director for the Bangkok International Trade Fair Project:

"This letter brings the very heartfelt thanks of the U.S. Information Agency for your exemplary cooperation and support for our . . . Project.

"Without the many color pictures supplied to us . . . our presentation in Bangkok would be far less effective. We need all the

help we can get in making better friends in Southeast Asia for U.S. policies, and the National Geographic's help has been deeply appreciated."

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

In addition to the cooperative research programs listed earlier in this report and in the Annual Report of the Committee for Research and Exploration, the Society continued its long history of close cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution in many other ways.

Assistance valued at \$1,880 was given to the National Gallery of Art for an exhibit on its 25th Anniversary. This consisted of donated National Geographic staff time plus such materials as film positives and composition. The Gallery was also given an NGS illustration for publication in their annual report.

The Division of Cultural Anthropology was given a color enlargement for a scientific exhibit; permission was given the Division of Military History to use National Geographic material in a lecture on the Battle of Hastings; 29 color transparencies were donated for underwater studies; historical and rare material on early aircraft was loaned to the National Air and Space Museum; and the Society has offered to cooperate with the Smithsonian's educational television series through use of motion pictures on Geographic expeditions and studies of anthropology in the Society's film archives.

WHITE HOUSE

The Society, of course, has always gladly cooperated fully with the First Family and officials on the President's staff in every way possible.

Continued extensive assistance was given by the Society's Special Publications Division and other staff members in the publication of Public Service Books on the White House, to aid in public understanding and knowledge of the Executive Mansion. This is dealt with more fully later in this report.

The Society's News Service prepared releases and other features, and prepared 80 press kits, including photographs, for the White House for its presentation of the new book, "The Living White House."

The National Geographic Magazine published two articles in 1966 of special interest to the White House: "Profiles of Presidents: Part V" (January) and "The Living White House" (November). The Society has received many letters commending it for these educational and patriotic articles. The value of these contributions is probably best expressed in the words of one Society member who wrote, "The story of The Living White House is . . . a story that every American should have in his home on his bookshelf for future generations to come . . ."

The Society has cooperated in preliminary plans for the Johnson Presidential Library to be patterned after the Society's own headquarters building.

The Society also presented the White House with two color prints of a Vietnamese landscape for official purposes.

The Society's Photographic Division loaned the White House photographer special equipment for photographs of the President and Mrs. Johnson.

At the specific request of President and Mrs. Johnson, National Geographic photographers covered the wedding ceremony of their daughter Luci in the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception; developed the pictures in its laboratories on a crash, overtime basis; and in its role as still photographic pool, provided copies to all news media. Geographic staff unselfishly devoted more than 700 hours to all phases of this event.

Mrs. Johnson expressed the appreciation of the President and herself in this letter to Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, President of the Society:

"The truly beautiful photograph of Luci and Pat exchanging vows—which appeared on the cover and in so many magazines and newspapers throughout the world—will long live joyously in the memories of us all."

"Most sincerely and enthusiastically, may I express our deep appreciation for the cooperation extended by the National Geographic on this all-important event in our lives. In particular, may we commend Mr. Gilka (Director of Photography) and his entire creative photographic staff for their dedication and assistance."

As a further cooperation with the White House on the American Beautification Campaign, the Society donated 500 maps of the District of Columbia to the White House for distribution at the National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation.

OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The Society has cooperated to the best of its ability in two areas of fiscal concern to the Government: inflation and balance of trade. For the 10th consecutive year it was found possible to maintain dues at the same rate, because of economies and innovations effected by the Society, thus helping in the fight against inflation. As to the balance of trade problem, as a matter of policy all Society staff, who travel extensively all over the world, are required to use American carriers whenever possible.

There were numerous tours of the Society's photographic facilities by various government departments and agencies.

The Federal Aviation Agency was given four pictures for a publication including Admiral Byrd's historic flight over the North Pole.

The Society's Photographic Department gave extensive advice to the chief of the photographic laboratory of the Department of Agriculture on equipment for a new laboratory. Agriculture was also given three photographs for the Department's Annual Report. The Society's museum staff cooperated with the Information Division of this Department in the construction of a kaleidoscope exhibit similar to one in the National Geographic's own museum, Explorers Hall. Two color pictures were given to Agriculture's Information Office for a booklet illustrating national beautification.

The Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education & Welfare, was given color transparencies for lectures on the subject of smallpox.

The Department of Commerce, Division of Design and Graphics, was assisted by the Society's Illustrations Librarian in setting up the Commerce Photo Library. Two photographs were supplied the U.S. Travel Service of Commerce in its "Visit USA" program.

The National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Executive Office of the President, was given 37 color transparencies for lectures on Experimental Stress Analysis.

A color print was provided the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to assist in its official programs.

The Society cooperated fully with the Census Bureau in surveys it conducts on manufacturing and on research.

Nearly 1,500 NGS maps were donated to the Government Printing Office.

CONGRESS

There are many examples of National Geographic Society assistance to the Congress, Members of Congress, and the Library of Congress.

Of prime importance is continuing support of the U. S. Capitol Historical Society, which is dealt with later in this report.

The Society donated reprints of old issues of the National Geographic Magazine to the Library of Congress. Thus, the Library can preserve its originals of this material in its Rare Book Division and make the reprints available to the public in its general collec-

tions. The Society also cooperates with the Library's Division for the Blind in its program for making the National Geographic Magazine available in a Braille Edition.

Pictorial and other National Geographic material was supplied to several members of Congress at their request, with the Society's compliments, for official purposes.

COOPERATION WITH STATES, UNITED NATIONS, AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Head Start Program, District of Columbia, was given 10,000 assorted Geographic School Bulletins to assist in its educational campaign. Some 660 copies of National Geographic Magazines were donated to National Library Week, D. C.

The State of Wyoming and the City of St. Louis were supplied with reprints of National Geographic articles on those two areas, for official use, at special prices. Also, the Ministry of State of Ceylon and the Province of Alberta received reprints of articles of particular interest to them on Ceylon and Alberta respectively.

Three pictures were provided the Public Affairs Office, D. C. Government, for a brochure to be distributed to members of the public seeking information about Washington, D. C. and its government.

One hundred copies of the May 1966 Geographic, containing a comprehensive article on Abu Simbel and its preservation, were donated to UNESCO to assist in its effort to preserve this historic Egyptian monument.

Other examples of cooperation with foreign governments are research programs, as noted earlier; complimentary Magazine subscriptions to embassies in Washington, as well as complimentary publications and lecture tickets; tours and receptions for visiting foreign dignitaries, student groups and others; and use of the Society's library by embassy representatives and other foreign officials.

PUBLIC SERVICE COOPERATION—MISCELLANEOUS

There are many examples of National Geographic cooperation with other nonprofit, scientific, educational or charitable organizations, which, although not a part of the government, engage in activities in support of government policies and programs, and which are of interest and assistance both to the government and the public at large. Some examples of donated materials and other aid follow:

University of Hawaii—photograph for an exhibit on "Ocean Engineering"; Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—enlarged color prints for exhibition; Mariners Museum, Newport News, Virginia—three Viking paintings and 100 reprints of an article from the National Geographic on discovery of Viking sites in the New World for a Museum exhibit; American National Red Cross—two illustrations for use in their filmstrip, "All Are Brothers"; color portrait for the Maryland State Bar Association; enlarged Admiral Peary photographs for the Arctic Museum; two photographs for a brochure of the American Society for Eastern Arts, a nonprofit foundation dedicated to the support of performing arts of the Near and Far East; two photographs for a text on Biological Sciences, sponsored by the American Institute of Biological Sciences under a National Science Foundation grant; eight enlarged color prints for the Gorgas Memorial Institute, Panama, to assist in their program of research on tropical diseases; 15 pictures to the nonprofit, educational Ford Museum of Greenfield Village; pictures for social studies texts; four photographs to the Catholic University for an encyclopedia; several prints of the old Court of Claims building for judges of that Court; 4,000 "Top of the World" maps and 200 District of Columbia maps to the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping; 12 "America's History-lands" book to the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for their annual patriotic

awards program; National Conference of Christians and Jews—print for display in connection with Brotherhood Week; Washington Gallery of Modern Art—80 maps of the District of Columbia for use in their Spring Education Program; Educational Television—use of National Geographic material for the "Children Everywhere" series for preschool children; offer to cooperate with the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency in supplying 5,000 copies of a new map of the District of Columbia to be published in 1967; 500 maps of Far East for "Books for Asia Students"; 20 National Geographic Magazines to the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine (article involving physiological effects of life undersea).

THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE

The Society's official journal is the main instrument for carrying out the Society's objective, "the increase and diffusion of geographic knowledge." The subjects included in its pages are scientific research, exploration, natural history, travel, and cultures of this and other lands, history, art, and numerous other subjects encompassed in the broad field of geography.

Each year there are many articles which present to the Society's members in an objective manner the activities and purposes of various Government departments and agencies. Already enumerated in this report are the articles on activities of the National Park Service and the National Aeronautics & Space Administration, as well as articles of particular interest to the White House and to the Armed Forces.

Complimentary copies of various issues of the Magazine were given to dozens of agencies on request, and in addition to complimentary subscriptions going to the State Department, Peace Corps, and Embassies as already noted, others are sent to the Post Office, Interior, Congress, NASA, National War College, Department of Defense, Library of Congress, Geological Survey, Navy, Smithsonian, United Nations, Commerce, Agriculture, Coast & Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau. Multiple complimentary copies are sent to the Arctic Operations Project (11) and Shriners Hospitals (72).

The Government finds the National Geographic of such informative and educational value that, in addition to the complimentary subscriptions and single issues noted, it has more than 6,600 subscriptions for the Armed Forces, Veterans Administration Hospitals, and Department of the Interior. As is the case with all Society publications, they are made available at special rates.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—CARTOGRAPHIC

The scientific and technical staff of the Society's Cartographic Division produces maps and globes of many sizes, scales, and projections for dissemination to its membership.

The maps also fit the requirements of many Government agencies so well that nearly 125,000 copies of maps and 250 World Globes were supplied to the Government at special rates, which are considerably lower than the prices paid by the Society's members. In addition, hundreds of maps were donated to various Government agencies.

During 1966 the Society made available to the Government, well in advance of general publication, a new physiographic map of Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand, since it was obvious that the Government would have a great interest in this map and find it valuable for our Armed Forces involved in Southeast Asia. The importance of this contribution is expressed by President Johnson in a letter to the Society's President, in which he says, "... It is a splendid work, in keeping with the Society's exceptional contributions to cartography over such a long period. ... The map, I can assure you, is already being put to good use. I know it will ease our

tasks considerably in that part of the world

Permission was given to various Government and nonprofit groups to use National Geographic map materials for official purposes; examples, the Civil Aeronautics Board, National Institutes of Health, Industrial Hygiene Foundation, and Educational Television.

Special tours of the Cartographic Division were arranged for top personnel and cartographic student groups of the Oceanographic Office, Geological Survey, Board on Geographic Names, Coast & Geodetic Survey, National Parks Service, Wildlife Refuge, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, USAF Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, Armed Forces Education and Information, Army Map Service, Bureau of Public Roads, and National Science Foundation.

The Society owns three valuable, unique 30-inch optical mirrors. For many years they have been, and during 1966 remained on loan to the Government. One is used by the Army Map Service, another by the USAF Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, and the third by the U.S. Navy Photographic Interpretation Center.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—NEWS SERVICE

During 1966 the National Geographic Society's News Service continued to make its services freely available to government agencies, and especially USIA and the Voice of America as already noted in this report.

The News Service prepares and issues some 300 News Bulletins yearly on geography, natural history, and related science, which in addition to 2,500 newspapers and other media throughout the world, are sent—at their request—to 29 Federal agencies as well as the official press services of several foreign countries.

The News Service continued its policy of using its Bulletins to aid in public understanding of the work of many government agencies. Particular attention was paid to the activities of the National Park Service and the National Aeronautics & Space Administration, but there were others of interest to the Weather Bureau, Smithsonian Institution, Treasury, Bureau of Public Roads, Coast & Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Standards, the Armed Forces, and the Atomic Energy Commission. National Geographic maps published in 1966 were offered to recipients of the News Service feature service. Many map requests from government agencies were filled on a complimentary basis, notably for maps of Viet Nam.

Other examples of cooperation with the Government are as follows:

NGS photos supplied to the Defense Department of Research & Engineering and other Pentagon officials; copies of five releases on peaceful uses of the hydrogen bomb to AEC Public Information Division; material on the Society supplied for USIA's Tehran publication Kazen Guilenpour; handling publicity for NASA on presentation of the White Space Trophy to the 1966 recipient, Edward H. White, II; collaboration with the Director of Information & Education, Forest Service, in that agency's educational work; and handling press announcements and other publicity for the American Antarctic Expedition involving the Navy and the National Science Foundation.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—GEOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

This Division continued its assistance to the Government by answering inquiries on geographic subjects and filling many special requests from a wide variety of departments and agencies.

Members of both houses of Congress continue to ask for geographic and scientific information for guidance in the preparation of legislation and in letters to constituents. Occasionally, at the request of Congressmen, the Division prepares appropriate replies.

The Division forwards to government offices specimens of birds, mammals, etc., collected by staff personnel or sent in by members of the public.

Many queries were answered about official flags, seals and coats-of-arms of countries of the world, and definitions were furnished of geographic terms and relationships. Assistance was given the National Zoological Park of the Smithsonian Institution in answering inquiries and making photographs available. The Smithsonian was also assisted with research on numerous place names and locations. There were countless other inquiries, many from the Pentagon and National Institutes of Health, on distances between points and location of obscure places. The National Park Service called on Geographic Research for information pertinent to animal survival studies and for the names of specialists in various fields of interest to the Service.

Magazines and maps were made available to many agencies and offices on request on a complimentary basis.

Various Government offices were given background data on areas of special interest, such as climatic conditions, vegetation, topography, temperature ranges, area figures, and the like, not available in their own libraries. Frequently this type of information plus other on roads, harbors, and other physical features is requested by and given to government contractors in order to help them fulfill government requirements and projects.

Copy of a rare 18th century French map was donated to the Library of Congress.

At the request of the National Science Foundation a number of South American sites suitable for observing a total solar eclipse were recommended.

The U.S. Information Agency was supplied with comprehensive information on topography, climate, etc., on an area in Africa for use in an official publication. The Department of Labor is regularly supplied with current lists of all the independent countries of the world together with their possessions and status, and an explanation of political terms used.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—PHOTOGRAPHIC DIVISION

During 1966 the Society gladly continued its policy of making available to the Federal Government without charge its wealth of color and black-and-white photographs. As has been noted throughout this report, many agencies make use of the Society's photographic files—among them the Army, Navy and Air Force and other branches of the Defense Department; Treasury, Interior, State, Peace Corps, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, U.S. Information Agency, Smithsonian Institution, Agriculture, and Commerce.

More than 2,050 unique photographs and reproductions of paintings, covering areas all over the world, were donated to the Government in 1966. The real value of this contribution to the Government lies in the fact that these illustrations are unique and unobtainable through other sources; they are readily available from the Society; and they represent a sizeable expenditure in salaries and expenses to obtain them.

Other examples of Photographic Department cooperation have been mentioned throughout this report, major examples being assistance to the White House, assignment of a staff photographer to the NASA Gemini Project, and the work of the Illustrations Staff in the Air Force's "Flying Short Course" program.

SCHOOL SERVICE COOPERATION

The public service aspects of the School Service and its National Geographic School Bulletin, which is published under a substantial subsidy, are treated fully in another exhibit. In addition to its educational serv-

ice to the public, the School Service cooperated with the Government in a number of ways:

During 1966 there were 512 pages published in the School Bulletin, of which 87 pages, or 13%, told the readers of Federal projects, agencies, or preserves and performed an information function usually performed by the Government itself. There were 40 such articles, which included New U.S. Outpost (National Science); Dr. Hugh L. Dryden (NASA); Friendly Ghost Town (Bureau of Land Management); Cuba (Coast Guard); Elk in Redwood Wilderness (National Park Service); Sand Dunes (NPS); Shipping Lanes (Coast Guard); Canyonlands (NPS); Space Models (NASA); Military Miniatures (Marine Corps); U.S. Capitol; City of Washington; Biological Clocks (NASA); Florida Key Deer (NPS); Key West Refuges (Fish & Wildlife); Florida Snails (NPS); High School Geography Project (National Science); Weather Bureau; Olympic National Park; Statue of Liberty (NPS); Peace Corps Training; U.S. Geography (Geological Survey); Washington National Zoo; Seneca Rocks (NPS); Eltanin (Navy); Paradise Glacier (NPS); Buck Island National Monument; Apache Reservation (National Wilderness System); Pathfinding Machines and Space Camera (NASA); Zinjanthropus Artist (Smithsonian); Earthquakes (National Earthquake Center); Redwoods National Park; Superstition Mountains (Forest Service); 50th Anniversary of National Park Service; Rockhounds (Smithsonian); Inter-American Geodetic Survey; Space Age Giants (NASA); Forest Service; Christmas Trees (NPS).

The School Service also provided government agencies with thousands of complimentary copies of School Bulletins and other educational publications during 1966. As noted previously, 40,000 Bulletins went to the Department of Interior and 10,000 to the Head Start Program. Some others were Office of Education, Coast Guard, Peace Corps, Oceanographic Center, Labor, Air Force, Army Map, and Congress. Another 1,500 were donated to the nonprofit conservation group, Appalachian Volunteers.

TELEVISION DIVISION COOPERATION

The public service aspects of this heavily subsidized, educational service are dealt with in another exhibit. The Division cooperated with the Government in several important ways during 1966.

The Chief of the Television Division is a member of the committee of the Capitol Historical Society which is preparing a film planned for the Nation's Capitol. This is to be a carefully prepared film depicting the Capitol's history and promoting interest in the Capitol.

Arrangements have been made to make the Society's film available to the Armed Forces overseas upon request from the Government. In addition, films have been loaned to National Aeronautics and Space Administration to assist in its official functions.

LECTURE DIVISION COOPERATION

This educational service is also dealt with elsewhere. Like all departments of the Society, it assists Government agencies in any way possible. During 1966, for instance, the Association of the United States Army was given aid in technical demonstrations, as reported earlier in this report. Also, film was supplied to the National Film Board of Canada and to a Swiss quasi-government organization for official use. An album of color prints on Mt. Kennedy was given to Senator Robert Kennedy. Approximately 100 tickets to the Society's annual lecture series were given to embassies in Washington.

BOOK SERVICE AND SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS DIVISION COOPERATION

The extensive cooperation given to the Government by the Society's Special Publi-

cations Division is discussed more fully later in this report.

The Society's scientific and educational book publications are of such value to the Government that during 1966 more than 2,600 were purchased at special low Government rates. In addition, many copies were donated for various Government purposes.

Among publications during 1966 of special interest to the Government, as well as to all Americans, was "Our Country's Presidents," a lively and colorful account of all American Presidents.

LIBRARY COOPERATION

The Library of the National Geographic Society contains about 45,000 volumes, a periodical collection, and an extensive clipping service, all of which emphasize geography and its allied sciences. The Library is open to the public and numbers among its patrons persons from all branches of the Government, armed services, diplomatic corps, college and university professors and students, and the general public. Many of these used Society materials for extensive research.

Approximately 231 librarians toured the Library to inspect its special facilities and equipment. Of particular note was a large group from the Department of Interior Workshop In-training Program and another from National Security Agency.

The National Geographic Society's facilities and materials were in constant use by Government agencies, among them the Air Force, Army, Bureau of Public Roads, Census, CIA, Agriculture, Federal Reserve, Geological Survey, HEW, FHA, Interior, Library of Congress, NASA, Archives, Bureau of Standards, National Library of Medicine, National Science Foundation, several departments of the Navy (Medical School, Oceanographic Office, Observatory, Research Laboratory, Ships Systems Command, Supplies Systems Command, Surgeon General), Office of Education, Smithsonian Institution, State Department, and Veterans Administration.

PERSONNEL OFFICE

The Society's Personnel Department cooperated with the Federally supported "On-The-Job Training Project" and has hired several people from the program.

Assistant Personnel Director Mahon has been active with the D.C. Department of Public Welfare in their work and training opportunity center, and has also cooperated with and offered employment to deaf key-punch operators through a program sponsored by the D.C. Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Personnel Officers have also assisted in recruiting trainees for the Institute for Employment Training, which is supported to large extent by the U.S. Employment Service and United Planning Organization.

The Society also continued its cooperation during 1966 in the "Summer Jobs for Youth Campaign" sponsored by the Vice President of the United States, and the Vice President expressed his appreciation for the Society's assistance in these words:

"Our youth and our nation have benefited by your action, and I congratulate you on the role you played in opening opportunities to youths. I would hope, too, that your satisfaction with your contribution to the future is equal to my pride in knowing that there are people like yourself standing ready to help."

EXPLORERS HALL EXHIBITS

Explorers Hall, a public museum covering the entire ground floor of the Society's headquarters at 17th and M Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C., displays several exhibits resulting from expeditions carried out in cooperation with the Federal Government. They are a cast of a giant Olmec stone head from joint Society-Smithsonian Institution expeditions to southern Mexico, 1938-46; gondola

and fittings of the balloon Explorer II, which explored the stratosphere in a joint National Geographic-Army Air Corps project in 1935; reconstruction of an Indian kiva from Wetherill Mesa, Mesa Verde National Park, studied in cooperation with the National Park Service in a five-year program, 1959-63; an exhibit commemorating attainment of the North Pole in 1909 by Comdr. Robert E. Peary, USN; mementos of Comdr. Richard E. Byrd, USN, who, in cooperation with the Society, served on several Arctic and Antarctic expeditions.

More and more, the major exhibit areas of Explorers Hall illustrate the Society's tangible support of scientific projects throughout the world. Visitors are enthusiastic in their praise of the Society's assistance given to such contemporary efforts abroad as Dr. Leakey's search for earliest man in Africa; Captain Cousteau in his oceanographic research projects; the salvaging of ancient Nile monuments and sites; and, at home, in the support given National Parks projects and space research programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Throughout the year Explorers Hall was host to many State Department guests from abroad. Special tours were provided for Members of Parliament of Tanzania, and Ambassadors and staffs from a number of embassies, usually resulting from close cooperation in our exhibits.

Explorers Hall has become one of Washington's most popular attractions and it is gratifying to see these facilities enjoyed so widely by the guests of many Members of Congress, Government offices, and agencies.

TOURS AND RECEPTIONS—GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

Many representatives or affiliates of Government agencies were given special tours of the Society's headquarters. These included not only tours of Explorers Hall but also of the Society's cartographic and photographic facilities, which are informative and useful in carrying out the official duties of such guests. Among these official groups were representatives of the Air Force, the 87th Congress, Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty, Navy Civil Engineer Corps, Department of Agriculture, World Bank, State Department, USIA, Naval War College, Parliament of Tanzania, Advisory Board for National Parks, Marine Corps, and NASA.

The Society also offered its hospitality at receptions for such Government organizations as the Naval Academy, Advisory Board of the National Park Service, and the Air Force (General Thomas D. White Aerospace Trophy ceremony).

Explorers Hall is open to the public every day of the year except Christmas Day. During 1966 there were 353,042 visitors and in the three years that this public museum has been in operation there have been 1,091,634 visitors. As many as 5,000 people have visited the Hall in the course of a single day.

PUBLIC SERVICE GRANTS

In the financial statement accompanying the Society's Information Return for 1966 is a complete list of Public Service Grants made in furtherance of scientific, educational, historical, charitable, and other public service goals of many nonprofit organizations engaged in activities which support Government goals and interests.

During 1966 they totaled \$1,383,705, including such public service, scientific and educational activities conducted by the Society itself, such as educational television, Explorers Hall, News Service, etc., which are described in detail in other exhibits accompanying the Society's Information Return.

Another \$108,031 in salaries of Society staff was contributed for editorial and production support of public service books published by the White House Historical Association and the United States Capitol Historical So-

ciety. This contribution is described in more detail under Public Service Books.

The Society made available on a rent-free basis valuable office space in its 16th and M Streets building to several public service organizations during 1966: U.S. Capitol Historical Society, Association of American Geographers, People-to-People Program, Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, and the National Conference on State Parks. Free storage space was also provided for the Washington National Monument Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association. The fair rental value of this space for the year amounted to \$67,557.

The Society made a number of direct Public Service Grants in support of a variety of important scientific, educational, and charitable activities, as follows:

United Givers Fund (local charities), \$10,000; John Oliver LaGorce Award to Outstanding Cadet in Geography, Air Force Academy (education), \$315; International Doll Library Foundation (education), \$5,000; Gilbert Grosvenor Memorial Fund at Amherst College (education), \$5,000; National Park Service (government), \$4,728; Metropolitan Police Boys Club, \$200; Anderson Award for Outstanding War College Student (education), \$150; Better Business Bureau (civic), \$200; Walter K. Myers Lectureship (medical education), \$1,000; Wildlife Management Institute (conservation), \$104; Hugh L. Dryden Memorial Fund (science and education), \$5,400.

PUBLIC SERVICE BOOKS

During 1966 the Society continued its policy of cooperating with several nonprofit, education public service organizations in telling the story of American Government to the people of the country.

Earlier counterparts of this report have outlined the Society's role in assisting the White House Historical Association to produce a book on the White House, "The White House: an Historic Guide," and a book on American Presidents, "The Presidents of the United States of America"; the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to publish "We, the People," a history of the United States Capitol; and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association to produce a book on the Supreme Court, "Equal Justice Under Law." Thus, the Society has had a key part in producing, as a public service, histories of the three principal branches of Government: Executive, Legislative, and Judicial.

As reported in 1965, the National Geographic Society also assisted the nonprofit Washington National Monument Association in publishing a history of George Washington and the Washington Monument.

During 1966 the Society's Special Publications Division produced one new public service book, "The Living White House," and revised two others—"We, the People," and "The White House: an Historic Guide."

The Fourth Edition of "We, the People" was published in May 1966. Geographic staff members devoted a total of 437 regular and 143 overtime hours to its production. 400,000 copies were printed, bringing to 1,450,000 the total number of copies of all editions of the Capitol Book.

The book was revised to the extent of eight new photographs; text changes on 25 pages; and corrections on all plates to improve color.

The sixth edition (120,000 copies) of "The White House: an Historic Guide," was published in June 1966. Geographic staff devoted 1,086 regular and 257 overtime hours to production of the book. A total of 1,825,000 copies have now been printed. Four pages were added to the book, bringing the total to 156 pages. Text changes were made on all pages, and 21 new photographs were included, either as new material or as substitutions. All of the plates were remade, reproofed and corrected to improve color over previous editions.

"The Living White House," the sixth pub-

lic service book produced by the Society, was published in November 1966 in an edition of 250,000 copies. As its part in producing the book, the Society contributed all writing, editing, photography, layout, quality control, and other supporting editorial operations as a public service. Geographic staff devoted 15,489 regular and 1,827 overtime hours to production of this new book.

In addition to publishing "The Living White House," members of the Society's staff assisted in the publicity work for the book, preparing news releases and photographs. The releases and photographs were incorporated in press kits issued by Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, press secretary to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Geographic staff members also made over-size black-and-white and color prints with legends which were displayed at the presentation ceremony at the White House on November 28, 1966.

At the request of the White House Historical Association, the Society prepared posters with photographs of the Association's three books for use at the Sales Desk at the White House.

The Society has agreed to supply the White House Historical Association and the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, at cost, photographs and transparencies taken from material in their respective books. In addition to laboratory time required for this work, at least an additional 80 hours of unreimbursed staff time were involved in filling requests during 1966.

A summary of the hours and their value contributed by the Society as a public service during 1966 in production of these three books follows:

"We, the People" (4th edition):	
Regular hours.....	437
Overtime hours.....	143½
Cost.....	\$3,946
"The White House Guide" (6th edition):	
Regular hours.....	1,086
Overtime hours.....	254
Cost.....	\$8,775
"The Living White House":	
Regular hours.....	15,489
Overtime hours.....	1,827
Cost.....	\$95,310
Total regular hours.....	17,012
Total overtime hours.....	2,224½
Total cost.....	\$108,031

The value of the Society's contributions in making these Public Service Books possible is seen in the many favorable comments about them from government officials and the public alike.

The Society continues to assist these organizations in many other ways to carry out their educational and patriotic objectives. As already noted, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society has been supplied with rent-free office space in the National Geographic's 16th Street Building. Permission was given to this organization to publish a unique drawing of the Capitol, prepared by National Geographic staff, in its "Newsletter."

Also, as noted previously, the Society provides free storage space to the Washington National Monument Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

In the spring of 1966, at the request of the Supreme Court, the National Geographic Society assisted in setting up an exhibit on the Supreme Court as a unit of the National Law Enforcement Exhibit in New York City. The exhibit featured back-lighted transparencies from the Society's Public Service book on the Supreme Court, "Equal Justice Under Law." The Society's laboratory provided internegatives for the display, and legend material was composed, researched and set in type by Society staff.

The Society made a grant of \$40,525 to the Association of American Geographers, a non-profit educational organization of geography

teachers, technical geographers, and other scientists and educators, for editorial assistance in the preparation of a book on the geography of New England to serve as a pilot volume in a proposed six volume series of supplemental reading on regions of the United States. In addition, the Society has contributed editorial, photographic and cartographic assistance as a public service.

A summary of National Geographic Society assistance in the field of Public Service Publications, through calendar year 1966, shows the following direct grants and expenses:

White House Historical Association:	
Editorial labor 1962-66 in connection with preparation of "White House" book, "Living White House" and "Presidents" book.....	\$182,335.28
Engraving costs on "White House" book, 1962.....	78,731.74
Total direct contribution.....	261,067.02
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made and repaid in 1963.....	100,000.00
U.S. Capitol Historical Society:	
Cash Contribution, 1963.....	10,000.00
Editorial labor in connection with preparation of "We, The People" book, 1963-66.....	74,617.07
Office space donated December 1963 to March 1967.....	24,375.00
Total direct contribution.....	108,992.07
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made in 1963, repaid in 1964.....	211,397.58
Foundation of the Federal Bar Association:	
Editorial labor in 1965 in connection with preparation of "Equal Justice Under Law," Supreme Court book.....	95,301.08
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital, made in 1965.....	180,353.05
Less amount repaid to date.....	4,541.43
Balance still unpaid.....	175,811.62
Washington National Monument Association:	
Editorial labor in 1965 in connection with preparation of "Washington: Man and Monument".....	31,007.52
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital to pay cost of book in 1965.....	130,000.00
Less amount repaid to date.....	32,302.25
Balance still unpaid.....	97,697.75
John F. Kennedy Library:	
Preparation of book on President Kennedy Library Association of American Geographers: Public service grant for New England book (Reimbursable).....	40,525.00
Daughters of American Revolution: Preparation of DAR Story.....	182.84
Grand total.....	1,125,055.14

In addition to this more than one million dollars in grants and direct National Geographic payroll costs, the organizations concerned have greatly benefited from the expert knowledge of key staff people in the Society's Editorial, Illustrations, Book Service, Special Publications, Color Laboratory,

Geographic Art, Photo-typographic, Geographic Research, Photography, and Printing Production departments. No dollar value can be placed on the sharing of this knowledge.

They benefit, too, from the assistance given by several of the Society's officers and Trustees, who serve these public service organizations and give freely of their time and advice.

Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, National Geographic Society President and Editor, serves on the Boards of the White House Historical Association and the Washington National Monument Association. It was through his initiative that this series of public service publications began, and he has served in an editorial capacity on most of them. Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, Society Trustee, is a charter member of the White House Historical Association.

Dr. Melvin M. Payne, the Society's Executive Vice President and Secretary, is a Vice President and Trustee of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, and it was largely because of his executive and administrative assistance that the Capitol Society was organized and the history of the Capitol brought to fruition. He was also instrumental in publication of the Supreme Court book, serving as Editor-in-chief for this project.

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Vice President of the Society, serves the White House Historical Association as a trustee and the Capitol Historical Society as an honorary trustee.

Because of the generous grants made to them, and because of the advice, assistance, and labor of the Society's executive, editorial, illustrations, and business staffs, both the White House Historical Association and the Capitol Historical Society have become self-sufficient and are now able to better carry out their chartered educational, historical, and civic purposes. An instance is refurbishing the White House by the White House Historical Association. The Society, however, continues to maintain active liaison with both groups and still renders substantial assistance to them. Hopes are that the Society's public service publications on the Supreme Court and the Washington Monument will bear the same fruit.

As it always has in the past, the National Geographic stands ready in the future to render worthwhile public services in the national interest to the Government and to public service organizations to the best of its ability.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to join with my distinguished colleague and fellow Scout, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], in pointing out the sad fact that the proposed Internal Revenue Service regulations would damage the outstanding work of a variety of nationally known groups, including the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts.

I happen to be a member of three additional organizations, besides the Boy Scouts, which would be harassed by the IRS, if these proposed regulations are allowed to stand. I am proud to be a member of the Billings, Mont., Kiwanis Club, one of more than 750,000 Kiwanians in the United States, Canada, and several foreign nations who are united in service this year under the goal of

"Quality Leadership—Key to the Future."

As a Kiwanian, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the objectives of Kiwanis International which remain constant. They are:

To give primacy to the human and spiritual, rather than to the material values of life.

To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.

To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards.

To develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.

To provide, through Kiwanis clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities.

To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

These proposed regulations would hit the excellent publication of Kiwanis International, the Kiwanis magazine.

They would also strike at the great humanitarian work of the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children. I am equally proud of my membership in Shrine, and know that I do not have to delineate the much-needed work done by these hospitals. The third organization which I mentioned earlier is the American Bar Association, about which others will have more to say. I take pride in my profession as a lawyer and in the high ethics promoted by this great group, known familiarly to those of us in the legal profession as the ABA.

Mr. Speaker, I not only protest this attempt to hinder the work of these voluntary groups, but I have also introduced appropriate legislation to make it clear that the revenue from these public service publications is tax exempt. My bill, H.R. 9468, is identical to bills introduced by my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. WATTS and Mr. BROYHILL.

Under my bill the advertising income in publications of education, charitable, and scientific nonprofit associations, such as the Boy Scouts, Kiwanis, the Shrine, and the American Bar Association, just to mention a few, would be considered to be related to the objectives for which the organizations were established and given tax-free status.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for according me the privilege of joining with him to protest this injustice.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House, and I would like to associate myself with his stand.

Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at the Scout's oath to know the type of values Scouting seeks to inculcate in our young people:

On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and Country and to obey the Scout Law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

A good part of our national time, money, and effort are aimed at trying to impress our young people with the self-respect and attitudes involved in that oath. Now we are witnessing an attempt to tax one of Scouting's main sources of revenue. Surely, we have not reached a point in our national history at which we are forced to tax the income of such organizations.

If any activity is to receive a tax break, it should be the one which turns out individuals who are trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

The approximate \$100,000 revenue loss may be considered small indeed when measured against the possible gains.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri yielding to me in this instance.

There are just a few things which I would like to say along the lines of what the gentleman from Missouri has said.

First, a word about the gentleman from Missouri himself.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman in this body, we watch with very real interest the various roles that are played by different Members of this industrious assembly, which includes the distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, and other individual Members.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, commend the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for what I consider to be a very valuable role which the gentleman has played in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I find that there has not been a day during which I have been on the floor of the House that I do not likewise find the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement, unfortunately, which can be said about some of our fellow Members.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is one who spends a great many hours here giving consideration to and careful attention to all that takes place in this body, an attribute which is so badly needed.

I commend the gentleman from Missouri for what I consider a very real, major contribution to the work of this body. So far as the particular subject matter of the day is concerned, I personally approve the Internal Revenue Department very carefully and fairly and uniformly enforcing the law that we of the Congress have written, but at the same time I read in what the gentleman from Missouri has said, and what the other people have said here on the floor today, no criticism of that approach, but I do read a very great deal of criticism over a situation of enforcement which somehow takes a law which has been on the books for an extended period

of time, and with this on the books a series of practices have grown up, impliedly perfectly proper practices, and then all of a sudden some 16 years or so after we of the Congress wrote the law upon the books, they suddenly come up with an interpretation which is vastly different than the interpretation which has been followed as those years have marched on, and as the policies have become an ingrained part of the procedures that organizations like the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts have followed.

Any one of us who watches carefully the warp and woof and fabric of America knows the critically important role organizations like these play. Government has a major role to play in America, but so also do the voluntary private organizations like those to which the gentleman from Missouri has addressed his remarks today. And when an action like this, without the direct sanction of the Congress and without the direct approval of the Congress, suddenly appears on the record threatening to do critical injury to organizations like these which are so very important to our American system, then I join in a very real expression and a strong expression of concern and apprehension that this action not be continued without direct action being taken by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I close with once again commending the gentleman from Missouri for calling the attention of this body to what is a very significant action on the part of the Internal Revenue Department at the present time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments which, like the lark singing on high, is as beautiful to my ears as is the Rose of Oregon that the gentleman wears in his lapel.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe the gentleman has put his finger exactly on the point that we are trying to make here, namely the ubiquitousness of the arrogation of power and the suddenness in doing damage to these outstanding training, educational, and cultural institutions. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling the attention of this body to the proposal of the Internal Revenue Service to tax the advertising income of certain professional journals. And I would like to join today with other Members of the House who are concerned by this precipitous action.

While the IRS has without doubt the authority to issue regulations interpreting the laws Congress passes, it also has the obligation to maintain the intent of Congress in those regulations.

For the 17 years that this law has been on the statute books no administration has made proposals to tax this particular form of income. No administration has maintained that such taxation was the intent of Congress.

It is, therefore, my contention that for action with such far-reaching ramifications, the Congress should certainly have been involved.

Furthermore, there are substantive and

policy issues involved in this change which affect organizations of many different types. Action and determinations of such import properly belong to Congress.

The role of Congress must not be taken over by administrative decree. And Congress itself must assert its own authority. I urge that we do exactly that.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Missouri, Dr. HALL, and others in the House in expressing deep concern over the notice of proposed rule-making issued by the Internal Revenue Service on April 13, 1967, pertaining to the treatment of income from unrelated trade or business.

Although I readily understand the need for constant review of tax regulations as times change, I feel that the ruling in question will have an adverse impact not intended by the Congress when it enacted the 1950 amendments to the Internal Revenue Act. I believe that this regulation, if fully implemented as proposed, would impose serious handicaps on some of our Nation's finest cultural, scientific, educational, and youth training organizations, and that many of these groups would be forced to either drastically curtail their services to a crippling level or cease to operate entirely.

I am particularly disturbed over the implications of this ruling for the scouting movement in America. In these days, all of us are understandably alarmed over the rising incidence of juvenile delinquency in our society—especially when we hear that during 1965, for instance, almost a million and a half juveniles—that is, young people under 18 years of age—were involved in police arrests of some description. We are disturbed, too, over FBI reports that the arrests of persons under 18 for serious crimes increased 47 percent in the 5 years from 1960 to 1965, while the increase of young people in this age group in our population for the same period was only 17 percent. These figures speak for themselves, and I do not think anyone will argue the seriousness of the situation and the problem for the future if this trend should continue. That is why I think we must exert increased efforts at all levels toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency wherever possible.

We in the Congress have sought to provide legislation and funds in an attempt to deal with the growing youth crime problem, and State and local governments have done likewise. But I think, too, that most of us will concede that while public programs can be of great benefit, the most important influences are still in such worthy organizations such as the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America. It seems incongruous, therefore, that the Internal Revenue Service proposes a ruling at this time which could cause these organizations to lose substantial portions of the income which permits them to make such a valuable contribution to American life.

Emerson once said that:

The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—but the kind of man the country turns out.

If we are to continue to have the caliber of young men and young women which the times demand, then we must help, not hinder, those organizations dedicated to the development of leadership qualities, patriotism, self-reliance, and service to others. In this light, it is my hope that the proposed ruling will be reviewed and revised.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for arranging this time today in order that we might discuss the serious inequities in the surprising action of the Internal Revenue Service in issuing the proposed regulation to tax the advertising incomes of most of America's educational, scientific, and charitable organizations.

As has been pointed out, organizations which would be adversely affected by the proposed action of the Internal Revenue Service would be the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America. I would like to discuss the concern of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, as outlined by their national executive director, Louise A. Wood, who is fearful that this proposal would limit future services of the national headquarters to their Girl Scout members.

The Girl Scouts of the United States of America is an organization chartered by the Congress to bring the Girl Scout program to all girls, 7 through 17 years of age, wherever they are. The organization's primary source of income is the \$1 membership dues from their members. At present they reach 3 million girls, or one out of every seven in the girl population 7 to 17 years of age. An important service to these girls is the American Girl magazine published by Girl Scouts of the United States of America as a companion to their program by translating their Girl Scout purposes and beliefs into magazine form.

Subscriptions do not cover the cost of the American Girl magazine. Advertising appropriate to girl activity and magazine content is also sought. The sale of advertising helps to meet the cost, and at present additional subsidy is also required from Girl Scout operations. If their limited advertising revenue were to be taxed in the future, Girl Scouts of the United States of America would have to reduce its other services for girls accordingly. In fact the question would probably have to be faced whether Girl Scouts of the United States of America could continue to publish this important vehicle to youth.

The Leader magazine is also published by Girl Scouts of the United States of America. It is the organization's major means of communication to their 600,000 adult volunteer members, most of whom serve as Girl Scout leaders. There is no subscription to the Leader magazine. Advertising revenue only partially supports this magazine. As in the case of the American Girl magazine, any tax to be paid on this revenue would result in further reduction of services to their membership.

I share the concern of the national executive director of the Girl Scouts and feel that the pending Internal Revenue Service regulation should be rejected in

order not to threaten the commendable program of the Girl Scouts of America.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to my colleagues who are speaking out in opposition to a proposed regulation of the Internal Revenue Service which would impose a 48-percent tax on the net advertising income on publications of some of our finest American institutions.

Organizations affected by this arbitrary action would include the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, National Geographic Society, and the American Bar Association, as well as many other worthy publications.

I have expressed my concern on many occasions about the administrative subversions of congressional intent; this is another example, in my opinion. The law on which the Internal Revenue Service is basing this action has been on the books for 17 years now, and has never been given the interpretation that it was intended to tax the advertising revenue of public service publications.

It is important for us to realize the uses to which the revenue under consideration is put by the organizations who produce these publications.

This revenue is not profit which is put into the pockets of publishers for their personal gain, or invested into competitive publishing enterprises. Rather, the revenue, as well as the rest of the income of these organizations, is used to carry on the public service efforts of these organizations.

As one who has served as a Boy Scout district chairman, I can tell you from personal experience that the funds of this organization are wisely and prudently spent, and that there is always a shortage of funds for the character building and training program of the Boy Scouts. These programs of citizenship building as well as programs such as the National Geographic's efforts to expand our knowledge of the world are badly needed in these times.

I urge the Congress to act to stop the proposal of the Internal Revenue Service from becoming effective. I offer my assistance in this effort.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, as an active participant for many years in the Scouting movement, I am concerned about the effect the proposed Internal Revenue Service regulation would have on this organization. The proposed 48-percent tax on the net advertising income of publications such as Boys' Life or American Girl would severely jeopardize the continued availability of their material designed to promote high ideals for American youth.

At this time in our Nation's history when so much is written and reported about the excessive crime rate and various forms of extremism among the young people, it is imperative that organizations such as the Boy and Girl Scouts be encouraged rather than hampered in attempts to reach youth and offer them incentives to better and more wholesome lives. One of the main goals of Scouting is to prepare boys and girls to be responsible citizens, and the role of Scout publications in this program is quite formidable.

Advertisements in these Scout magazines help to meet but do not cover the costs involved in publication. If a tax were to be levied on the income received from advertising, these publications would suffer tremendous losses in revenue which would curtail their ability to maintain current standards of coverage and presentation.

The organizations of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America are only two of a number of educational, charitable, and scientific nonprofit associations which will suffer if the proposed regulation is issued by the Internal Revenue Service Commissioner. I wish to join Dr. HALL and other Members of the House who today are requesting an examination of the full impact this regulation would have. It is my hope that Congress will take an active interest in quickly determining what is equitable in this situation which concerns future publications of some of our finest national organizations which contribute so much in public services to our citizens.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for bringing to our attention a proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to impose a tax that may kill off many of our public service publications.

It certainly comes as no surprise to hear "Doc" HALL speaking on behalf of the Boy Scouts, since he has been honored with the Silver Beaver and Silver Antelope Awards—two of Scouting's highest citations for outstanding volunteer service to the movement. This is true indication that he has served long and well the cause of American youth through the program of the Boy Scouts.

A great many organizations exempt from tax under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code are engaged in publishing activities and have been for many years. It is not unusual for those publications to carry advertising. In many cases this advertising reflects directly the interests of the organization or its members. In other instances the content of the advertising may not directly reflect such interests; but nonetheless, it contributes to the public or membership interest in the publication.

In speaking to the third annual American University tax conference earlier this year, Mr. Joel Barlow said:

Whatever the content or reader interest in the advertising appearing in an exempt organization publication, this advertising is a source of income which becomes available to the organization as a natural by-product of the publication's existence—just as ticket and program advertising income is a by-product of college athletics. Without the publication there would be no advertising opportunity.

If I could continue Mr. Barlow's thought, I would say that without the revenues that accrue from advertising there would be much less opportunity for the tax exempt organizations to perform their worthy services. Publications such as *Boys' Life*, *Nation's Business*, and the *National Geographic* contribute measurably to the knowledge of the interested public. While the American Medical Association does not encourage its members to advertise their services,

its membership and the general public certainly benefit by exposure through advertising to new medicinal products and equipment that is afforded by the Association's publications.

It is reasonable to assume that, without advertising income, many of the exempt organization publications would be limited, if not eliminated, in helping to support the functions and purposes of these organizations generally.

I might mention that our esteemed Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY was featured in Scouting's *Boys' Life* magazine within the past year, as was General Westmoreland, who attributes to his experience as a Scout, part of his success as a military commander.

Are we going to allow the Internal Revenue Service to undercut the largest youth movement in the free world? A movement that leads our youth to emulate such men as the Vice President and General Westmoreland? An organization that claims the allegiance of most of our astronauts and 328 Members of Congress?

Can we allow the sense of a 17-year-old law to be perverted so as to undermine the effectiveness of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, a group of young men dedicated to the credo that "service to humanity is the best work in life"?

Perhaps we forget how many millions or billions of Federal dollars are being spent annually in an effort—very often a futile effort—to develop the same kind of young man that the Scouts and the Jaycees are internationally famous for developing.

These organizations never ask for Federal dollars. They are self-supporting in a day and age when it isn't fashionable to be self-supporting. Is it really conceivable that the Internal Revenue Service would like to destroy that self-support?

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to participate in and comment on my special order today, and to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES PERMISSION TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the crime-taxed public is understandably trying to figure some way to bypass the Supreme Court and its lesser lights to restore law and order to the streets.

The repeated image and findings of a super National Crime Commission sound impressive even though its findings and recommendations are in left field.

In fact, the pretentious National Crime Commission is but a front to further attack policemen and local law and order. According to the 229-page report—printed at the expense of Mr. and Mrs. U.S. Taxpayer—the only criminal the Commission can find is society, and the police officer. Naturally, as a quasi-National Police Review Board, they could straighten out the crime problem.

The interesting part of the Commission is not what they say, but who it is that is saying it. To understand who is trying to "think for us," I place the names of the members of the Commission, which range from Whitney Young of the Urban League to Adam Yarmolinsky, the infamous Harvard professor, in the RECORD following my remarks. The report from which this list is taken, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," is available from the U.S. Government Printing Office at a price of \$2.25.

The names follow:

APPENDIX A. THE COMMISSION AND ITS OPERATIONS

I. THE COMMISSIONERS

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Chairman: Washington, D.C.; Under Secretary of State; U.S. Army Air Force, 1st Lieutenant, prisoner of war, awarded Air Medal With Three Clusters, 1941-45; Rhodes scholar, 1947-49; attorney, Department of the Air Force, 1950-52; Professor of Law, Yale Law School, 1952-56; Professor of International Law; University of Chicago, 1956-61; Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, 1961; Deputy Attorney General, 1962-65, Attorney General of the United States, 1965-66.

Genevieve Blatt: Harrisburg, Pa., attorney; Phi Beta Kappa; Secretary of Internal Affairs, Member, State Board of Pardons, State of Pennsylvania, 1955-67.

Charles D. Breitell: New York, N.Y.; Associate Judge, Court of Appeals of the State of New York; Deputy Assistant District Attorney, New York County, staff of Thomas E. Dewey, special rackets investigations, 1935-37; Assistant District Attorney, New York County, 1938-41; Chief of Indictment Bureau, 1941; Counsel to Governor, State of New York, 1943-50; Justice, Supreme Court of New York, 1950-52; Associate Justice, Appellate Division (First Department), Supreme Court of New York, 1952-66; Advisory Committee, Model Penal Code, American Law Institute; Chairman, Special Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice, Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Council, American Law Institute.

Kingman Brewster, Jr.: New Haven, Conn.; President, Yale University; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant, 1942-46; Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, 1950-53; Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, 1953-60; Provost, Yale University, 1960-63, author, "Anti-Trust and American Business Abroad" (1959); "Law of International Transactions and Relations" (with M. Katz, 1960).

Garrett H. Byrne: Boston, Mass.; attorney; District Attorney, Suffolk County, Mass.; Member, Massachusetts House of Representa-

tives, 1924-28; President, National District Attorneys Association, 1963-64; President, Massachusetts District Attorneys Association, 1963-64; President, National District Attorneys Foundation.

Thomas J. Cahill: San Francisco, Calif.; Chief of Police, San Francisco; entered San Francisco Police Department as patrolman, 1942; Big Brother of the Year Award, 1964; Liberty Bell Award, San Francisco Bar Association, 1965; Vice President, International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1963-; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the Governor on the Law Enforcement Section of the Disaster Office of the State of California; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the School of Criminology, City College, San Francisco; Member, National Advisory Committee, National Center on Police-Community Relations, Michigan State University.

Otis Chandler: San Marino, Calif.; Publisher, Los Angeles Times; U.S. Air Force, 1st Lieutenant, 1951-53; Senior Vice President, the Times-Mirror Co.; Member, Board of Directors, Associated Press, Western Airlines, Union Bank.

Leon Jaworski: Houston, Tex.; attorney, senior partner, Fulbright, Croker, Freeman, Bates & Jaworski; U.S. Army, Colonel, Chief, War Crimes Trial Section, European Theater, Legion of Merit, 1942-46; President, Houston Bar Association, 1949; President, Texas Civil Judicial Council, 1951-52; President, American College of Trial Lawyers, 1961-62; President, Texas Bar Association, 1962-63; Special Assistant U.S. Attorney General, 1962-65; Special Counsel, Attorney General of Texas, 1963-65; Executive Committee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; trustee, Houston Legal Foundation; Fellow, American Bar Foundation; U.S. Member, Permanent (International) Court of Arbitration; Member, National Science Commission; Chairman, Governor's Committee on Public School Education, State of Texas.

Thomas C. Lynch: San Francisco, Calif.; Attorney General, State of California; Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1933-42; Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1943-51; District Attorney, San Francisco, Calif., 1951-64; Fellow, American College of Trial Lawyers; Advisory Committee on Prearraignment Code, American Law Institute.

Ross L. Malone: Roswell, N. Mex.; attorney, partner, Atwood & Malone; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant Commander, 1942-46; Deputy Attorney General of the United States, 1952-53; President, American Bar Association, 1958-59; President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; Council, American Law Institute; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers; Board of Trustees, Southern Methodist University.

James Benton Parsons: Chicago, Ill.; Judge, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois; U.S. Navy, 1942-46; teacher, Lincoln University of Missouri, 1934-40, city schools of Greensboro, N.C., 1940-42, John Marshall Law School, 1949-52; Assistant Corporation Counsel, city of Chicago, 1949-51; Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1951-60; Judge, Superior Court of Cook County, Ill., 1960-61; Member, Committee on Administration of Probation System, Judicial Council of the United States; Chicago Commission on Police-Community Relations; Illinois Academy of Criminology.

Lewis Franklin Powell, Jr.: Richmond, Va.; attorney, partner, Hunton, Williams, Gay, Powell & Gibson; U.S. Army Air Force, Colonel awarded Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Croix de Guerre With Palms, 1942-46; Member, Virginia State Board of Education, 1961-; President, American Bar Association, 1964-65; Trustee, Washington and Lee University and Hollis College; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers, Vice President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee and General Counsel, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

William Pierce Rogers: Bethesda, Md.; attorney, partner, Royall, Koegel, Rogers &

Wells (New York and Washington); Assistant U.S. Attorney, New York County, 1938-42, 1946-47; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant Commander, 1942-46; Chief Counsel, U.S. Senate War Investigating Committee, 1948; Chief Counsel, Senate Investigations Subcommittee of Executive Expenditures Committee, 1948-50; Deputy Attorney General, 1953-57, Attorney General of the United States, 1957-61; Member, U.S. Delegation, 20th General Assembly, United Nations, 1965; U.S. Representative, United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Southwest Africa, 1967; Member, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, 1965-67; Fellow, American Bar Foundation.

Robert Gerald Storey: Dallas, Tex.; attorney, partner, Storey, Armstrong & Steger; Phi Beta Kappa, Order of Coif; U.S. Army, 1st Lieutenant, 1918-19, Colonel, Bronze Star, Legion of Merit, 1941-45; Assistant Attorney General, State of Texas, 1921-23; Executive Trial Counsel for the United States, trial of major Axis war criminals, Nuremberg, Legion of Honor (France), 1945-46; Dean, Southern Methodist University Law School, 1947-59; President, Texas Bar Association, 1948-49; President, American Bar Association, 1952-53; Member, Hoover Commission, 1953-55; President, Inter-American Bar Association, 1954-56; American Bar Association Gold Medal, 1956; Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1957-63; President, Southwestern Legal Foundation.

Julia Davis Stuart: Spokane, Wash.; President, League of Women Voters of the United States; Governor's Tax Advisory Council, State of Washington, 1958; Chairman, Citizens Subcommittee on School Finance, State of Washington Legislature, 1960; National Municipal League Distinguished Citizen Award, 1964; Member, National Citizens Commission on International Cooperation, 1965.

Robert F. Wagner: New York, N.Y.; attorney; New York State Assembly, 1938-41; U.S. Army Air Force, Lieutenant Colonel, 1942-45; New York City Tax Commission, 1946; Commissioner of Housing and Buildings, New York City, 1947; New York City planning Commission, 1948; President, Borough of Manhattan, N.Y., 1949-53; Mayor, New York City, 1954-66.

Herbert Wechsler: New York, N.Y.; Harlan Fisk Stone Professor of Constitutional Law, Columbia Law School; Assistant Attorney General, State of New York 1938-40; Special Assistant U.S. Attorney General, 1940-44; Assistant Attorney General of the United States, 1944-46; Member, U.S. Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure, 1941-45; Oliver Wendell Holmes Lecturer, Harvard Law School, 1958-59; Director, American Law Institute; Reported, Model Penal Code, American Law Institute; Member, New York State Temporary Commission on Revision of the Penal Law and Criminal Code; Member, Executive Committee, Association of the Bar, City of New York; author, "Criminal Law and Its Administration" (with J. Michael, 1940); "The Federal Courts and the Federal System" (with H. Hart, Jr., 1953); "Principles, Politics and Fundamental Law" (1961).

Whitney Moore Young, Jr.: New Rochelle, N.Y.; Executive Director, National Urban League; Dean, Atlanta University School of Social Work, 1954-60; Member, President's Committee on Youth Employment, 1962; Member, President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, 1963; Member, President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, 1965-66; Member, Special Presidential Task Force on Metropolitan and Urban Problems, 1965-66; Member, Advisory Committee on Housing and Urban Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development; President, National Conference on Social Welfare; Member, Advisory Board, A. Philip Randolph Institute; Member, National Board, Citizens Crusade Against Poverty; Trustee, Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation; author, "To Be Equal" (1964).

Luther W. Youngdahl: Washington, D.C.; Senior Judge, U.S. District Court, District of Columbia; U.S. Army, artillery officer, World War I; Judge, Municipal Court, Minneapolis, Minn., 1930-36; Judge, District Court, Hennepin County, Minn., 1936-41; Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Minnesota, 1942-46; Governor of Minnesota, 1947-51; Judge, U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, 1951-66.

APPENDIX B. CONSULTANTS AND ADVISERS

I. CONSULTANTS

General

Anthony G. Amsterdam, Professor, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jan Deutsch, Associate Professor, Yale University Law School, New Haven, Conn.

Arnold Enker, Professor, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minn.

Daniel Freed, Acting Director, Office of Criminal Justice, Department of Justice.

Howard Heffron, Professor, University of Washington Law School, Seattle, Wash.

Sanford H. Kadish, Professor, University of California Law School, Berkeley, Calif.

Michael March, Assistant to Chief, Education, Manpower and Science, Bureau of the Budget.

Frank Remington, Professor, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wis.

Arnold Sagalyn, Director of Law Enforcement Coordination, Department of the Treasury.

Donald A. Schon, President, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

Harry Subin, Associate Director, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, N.Y.

Administration of justice

Norman Abrams, Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., Special Assistant, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Sheldon Eelsen, attorney, New York, N.Y.

Gilbert Geis, Professor, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Abraham S. Goldstein, Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Zona F. Hostetler, Consultant, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Louis L. Jaffe, Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Arthur B. Kramer, Attorney, New York, N.Y.

John S. Martin, Jr., attorney, Nyack, N.Y.

Monroe E. Price, Associate Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Lee Silverstein, Research Attorney, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Patricia M. Wald, Commissioner, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

Lloyd L. Weinreb, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ASSESSMENT OF CRIME

Albert D. Biderman, Senior Research Associate, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Egon Bittner, Associate Professor of Sociology and Resident, Langley Porter Neuro-Psychiatric Institute, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, Calif.

Sol Chaneles, Director of Child Sex Victimization, American Humane Association, New York, N.Y.

Karl O. Christiansen, Professor, Det Kriminalistiske Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Jerome Daunt, Chief, Uniform Crime Reporting Section, FBI, Department of Justice.

Samuel Dunaif, M.D., Supervising Psychiatrist Jewish Family Service, New York, N.Y.

Otis Dudley Duncan, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Phillip Ennis, Senior Study Director, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Robert Fogelson, Associate Director, Department of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Howard Freeman, Professor, School of Social Work, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Jack Gibbs, Professor, Department of Sociology, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.

Gilbert Geis, Professor, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Donald Goldstein, Research Assistant, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Leroy O. Gould, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Reginald Lourie, M.D., Director of Psychiatry, Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Jennie McIntyre, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Sheldon Messinger, Vice Chairman, Center for the Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Samuel Meyers, Research Associate, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Kriss Novak, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wis.

Fred Powladge, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Peter Rossi, Director, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Phillip C. Sagi, Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Leonard D. Savitz, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Stephen Schafer, Professor, Department of Sociology-Anthropology, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.

Kark Schuessler, Professor, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Milton Shore, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James F. Short, Dean, Graduate School, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.

Jerome H. Skolnick, Center for Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Irving Spergel, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Ill.

Don D. Stewart, Washington, D.C.

Denis Szabo, Director, Institute of Criminology, University of Montreal, Canada.

Adrianne W. Weir, Research Analyst, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Marvin Wolfgang, Director, Center of Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Woolsey, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

William T. Adams, Assistant Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Myrl E. Alexander, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Gordon Barker, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Sanford Bates, Pennington, N.J.

Bertram Beck, Executive Director, Mobilization for Youth, New York, New York.

Alan Breed, Superintendent, Northern California Youth Center, Stockton, Calif.

Bertram S. Brown, M.D., Deputy Director, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Milton Burdman, Director, Division of

Parole and Community Service, Department of Corrections, Sacramento, Calif.

Richard Clendenen, Professor, Criminal Law Administration, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minn.

Fred Cohen, Professor of Law, University of Texas Law School, Austin, Tex.

John P. Conrad, Chief, Division of Research, Department of Corrections, Sacramento, Calif.

Thomas F. Courtless, Director of Criminological Studies, George Washington University Institute of Law, Psychiatry, and Criminology, Washington, D.C.

Roger Craig, attorney, Washington, D.C. LaMar Empey, Director, Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

T. Conway Esselstyn, Professor of Sociology, San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.

Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Sociology, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Robert H. Fosen, Research Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Ben Frank, Task Force Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Marcia Freedman, Research Associate, Office of Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Thomas E. Gaddis, Consultant, Research and Development, Division of Continuing Education, Oregon System of Higher Education, Portland Continuation Center, Portland, Ore.

Gilbert Geis, Professor, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Daniel Glaser, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Douglas Grant, Program Director, New Careers Development Project, Sacramento, Calif.

Keith S. Griffiths, Chief of Research, Department of Youth Authority, Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, Sacramento, Calif.

David H. Gronewold, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Edward J. Hendrick, Superintendent of Prisons, Department of Public Welfare, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harland L. Hill, Director, Research and Development, Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, Calif.

Garrett Heyns, Executive Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Barbara Kay, Task Force Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

John T. Kilkeary, Center Director, Bureau of Prisons, Pre-Release Guidance Center, Chicago, Ill.

Charles King, Executive Director, Wiltwyck School for Boys, New York, N.Y.

Barbara Knudson, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Howard Leach, Consultant, New Mexico Council on Crime and Delinquency, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Robert B. Levinson, Chief, Psychology Services, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Milton Luger, Director, New York State Division of Youth, Albany, N.Y.

Austin MacCormick, Executive Director, the Osborne Association, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Matthew Matlin, Editor, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

John M. Martin, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Malcolm Matheson, Visiting Assistant Professor, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California; Deputy Director of Corrections, Province of British Columbia, Canada.

Boyd C. McDivitt, Deputy Director, Office of Probation, New York, N.Y.

Richard F. McGee, Administrator, Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, Sacramento, Calif.

Roma K. McNickle, Editor, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

William G. Nagel, Executive Secretary, Governor's Council for Human Services, State of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

Sherwood Norman, Director of Detention Services, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

Lawrence Pierce, Chairman, New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, Albany, N.Y.

Barbara Pittard, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, George State College, Atlanta, Ga.

Kenneth Polk, Director, Research and Evaluation, Lane County Youth Project, Eugene, Ore.

Walter Reckless, Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Milton G. Rector, Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

Ernest Reimer, Chief, Correctional Program Services Division, California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, Calif.

Henry Reining, Jr., Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mark S. Richmond, Deputy Assistant Director, Community Services, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice

Ted Rubin, Judge, Juvenile Court, Denver, Colo.

Charles Shireman, School of Social Work, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Gerald M. Shattuck, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Fordham University, New York, New York

Clarence Schrag, Professor of Sociology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Saleem A. Shah, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Louis Tomaino, Director, Southwest Center on Law and the Behavioral Sciences, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

Robert Trimble, Executive Assistant to the Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, New York

Fred Ward, Southern Regional Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Austin, Tex.

Marguerite Q. Warren, Principal Investigator, Community Treatment Project, California State Youth Authority, Sacramento, Calif.

Robert Weber, Institutional Consultant, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

Leslie T. Wilkins, Professor, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Drunkenness

David Pittman, Director, Social Science Institute, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Peter Hutt, attorney, Washington, D.C.

Juvenile delinquency

Ivar Berg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Virginia M. Burns, Chief, Training Administration, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Aaron Cicourel, Professor, Center for Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Sanford J. Fox, Professor, Boston College Law School, Brighton, Mass.

Don M. Gottfredson, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Davis, Calif.

Paul Grams, Research Assistant, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Mich.

Robert F. Johnson, Executive Director, Wieboldt Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Edwin M. Lemert, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis, Calif.

Henry D. McKay, Division Chief, Division of Community Studies, Institute for Juvenile Research, Department of Mental Health, Chicago, Ill.

Kenneth Polk, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

Hyman Rodman, Senior Research Associate, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Mich.
Margaret K. Rosenheim, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Seymour Rubinfeld, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Walter E. Schafer, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

William H. Sheridan, Assistant Director, Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Leonard W. Stern, Chief, Demonstration Programs, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Jackson Toby, Professor, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Robert D. Vinter, Associate Dean, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Carl Werthman, Research Assistant, Center for Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director, Center of Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pa.

Narcotics

Dennis S. Aronowitz, Assistant Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Richard H. Blum, Professor, Project Director, Psychopharmacology Project, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Jonathan O. Cole, M.D., Chief, Psychopharmacology Research Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.
Michael P. Rosenthal, Assistant Professor of Law, Rutgers University, Camden, N.J.

Organized crime

G. Robert Blakey, Associate Professor, Notre Dame Law School, Notre Dame, Ind.

Donald R. Cressey, Dean, College of Letters and Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.

John Gardiner, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Rufus King, attorney, Washington, D.C.
Ralph Salerno, Central Intelligence Bureau, New York City Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Gus Tyler, Director, Department of Politics, Education, and Training, International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, New York, N.Y.

Police

Richard H. Blum, Professor, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Allen P. Bristow, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

William P. Brown, Professor, State University of New York, Albany, N.Y.

James E. Carnahan, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Adminis-

tration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Edward V. Comber, Project Director, Criminal Justice Information Systems Design Study, California Department of Justice, Sacramento, Calif.

J. Shane Creamer, First Assistant U.S. Attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

William F. Danielson, Director of Personnel, City of Berkeley, Calif.

Harry Diamond, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

George D. Eastman, Headquarters Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

John Fabbri, Chief of Police, South San Francisco, Calif.

Edward A. Farris, Professor of Police Science, New Mexico State University, University Park, N. Mexico.

James L. Fyke, Field Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

Raymond Galvin, Assistant Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

A. C. Germann, Professor, Department of Criminology, California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif.

Herman Goldstein, Professor, University of Wisconsin Law School Madison, Wis.

G. Douglas Gourley, Professor and Chairman, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

John Guidici, Captain, Oakland Police Department, Oakland, Calif.

Richard O. Hankey, Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

William H. Hewitt, Assistant Professor and Chairman, Department of Police Science, State University of New York, Farmingdale, N.Y.

Roy E. Hollady, Chief of Police, Fort Collins, Colo.

Norman C. Kassoff, Supervisor, Police Training Unit, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Joseph Kimble, Chief of Police, San Carlos, Calif.

Richard Laskin, Associate Professor, Department of Political and Social Science, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.

G. Stephen Lloyd, Field Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

Joseph D. Lohman, Dean, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Lawrence S. Margolis, Special Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, Department of Justice.

Gordon E. Misner, Visiting Associate Professor, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Richard A. Myren, Dean, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York, Albany, N.Y.

David L. Norrgard, Field Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

George W. O'Connor, Director, Professional Standards Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Bruce T. Olson, Police Administration Specialist, Institute for Community Development and Services, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

J. Kinney O'Rourke, Executive Director, Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns, Boston, Mass.

Margaret G. Oslund, Department of Political and Social Science, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.

Wesley A. Pomeroy, Undersheriff, San Mateo County Sheriff's Police Department, San Mateo, Calif.

Norman E. Pomrenke, Assistant Director,

Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Louis Radelet, Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Leonard E. Reisman, President, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, The City University of New York, New York, N.Y.

Gerald Robin, Office of National Analysts, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jewell L. Ross, Captain, retired, Berkeley Police Department, Berkeley, Calif.

James D. Stinchcomb, Supervisor, Police Education Unit, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Patricia M. Wald, Commissioner, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

John B. Williams, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Science and technology

Mary Ellen Angell, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

James E. Barr, Chief, Safety and Special Radio Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission.

Thomas Barte, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Mandell Bellmore, Associate Professor, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Robert Brookings Communications Engineer, City of Burbank, Calif.

Albert Bush-Brown, President, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, R.I.

Ronald Christensen, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Joseph Coates, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Robert Cohen, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Jerome Daunt, Chief, Uniform Crime Reporting Section, FBI, Department of Justice.

P. A. DonVito, Washington, D.C.

Ronald Finkler, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Saul I. Gass, International Business Machines, Inc., Rockville, Md.

Leonard Goodman, Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C.

Norbert Halloran, International Business Machines, Inc., Yorktown Heights, N.Y.

Janice Heineken, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

William Hermann, Police Consultant, Rand Corp. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Thomas Humphrey, International Business Machines, Inc., Houston, Tex.

Herbert Isaacs, Los Angeles, Calif.

Sue Johnson, Glen Head, N.Y.

Robert Jones, CEIR, Inc., Bethesda, Md.

Vincent Keenan, Paoli, Pa.

Peter Kelly, Kelly Scientific Corp., Washington, D.C.

Jerry Kidd, National Science Foundation.

Ray Knickel, Kelly Scientific Corp., Washington, D.C.

Richard Larson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Peter Lejins, Professor, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Charles McBride, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Lois Martin, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Robert Muzzy, Research Associate, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Frank Nauta, CEIR, Inc., Bethesda, Md.

Joseph Navarro, Institute of Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

William Offutt, International Business Machines, Inc., Rockville, Md.

Lloyd Perper, Tucson, Ariz.

S. Rothman, TRW Systems, Redondo Beach, Calif.

Thomas Schelling, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Marsha Smith, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Peter Szanton, Bureau of the Budget.

Jean Taylor, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Claude Walston, International Business Machines, Inc., Gaithersburg, Md.

Herbert Weiss, Litton Systems, Inc., Van Nuys, Calif.

Leslie T. Wilkins, Professor, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Marvin Wolfgang, Director, Center of Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

II. ADVISERS

Administration of justice

Francis A. Allen, Dean, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Richard Arens, Professor of Law, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

Sylvia A. Bacon, Assistant Director, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

Gary Bellow, Deputy Director, California Rural Legal Assistance, Los Angeles, Calif.

Charles L. Decker, Major General, U.S. Army (retired), Director, National Defender Project of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, Washington, D.C.

Richard A. Green, Project Director, A.B.A. Special Project for Minimum Standards for the Administration of Criminal Justice, New York, N.Y.

Louis R. Goodman, Washington, D.C.

Geoffrey Hazard, Jr., Administrator, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Richard A. Lavin, attorney, Newark, N.J.

Peter Lowe, Professor of Law, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Frank Miller, Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Tim Murphy, Judge, Court of General Sessions, Washington, D.C.

Herbert Packer, Professor of Law, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

A. Kenneth Pye, Associate Dean, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

Howard Rothwax, Director, Legal Services, Mobilization for Youth, New York, New York.

Barbara Roffwarg, New York, N.Y.

Murray L. Schwartz, Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Ted Small, Staff attorney, Office of Criminal Justice, Department of Justice.

James Thompson, Professor of Law, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.

Jack Weinstein, Professor of Law, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Dana Barbour, Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget.

Belton Fleischer, Professor, Department of Economics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Donald P. Kenefick, Director, National Association of Mental Health, New York, N.Y.

Gerald Levinson, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

James McCafferty, Research and Evaluation Branch, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Thorsten Sellin, Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Philip Selznick, Director, Center for the Study of Law and Society, Berkeley, Calif.

Henry Sheldon, Bureau of the Census.

Stanton Wheeler, Sociologist, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, N.Y.

CORRECTIONS

Stuart Adams, Project Director, Prison College Project, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Dean Babst, Research Associate, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

James V. Bennett, Consultant, Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C.

George Beto, Director, Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Tex.

Harold Boslow, M.D., Superintendent, Patuxent Institute, Jessups, Md.

Donald E. Clark, Sheriff, Multnomah County, Portland, Oreg.

Arthur Cohen, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

John Coons, Professor of Law, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.

Joseph B. Dellinger, Correctional Service Federation, Baltimore, Md.

Fred Fant, New York State Division of Probation, New York, N.Y.

Paul H. Gebhard, Institute for Sex Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Paul Gernert, Chairman, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Harrisburg, Pa.

Howard Gill, Director, Institute of Correctional Administration, American University, Washington, D.C.

Abraham Goldstein, Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Don M. Gottfredson, Director of Research, National Parole Institute, Davis, Calif.

John Grace, Commissioner, Salvation Army, New York, N.Y.

Alfred Hantman, Chief, Criminal Section, U.S. Attorney's Office, Washington, D.C.

Solomon Kobrin, Institute of Juvenile Research, Chicago, Ill.

Belle Lead, Lieutenant Colonel, Volunteers of America, New York, N.Y.

Peter Lejins, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Arthur R. Mathews, Jr., Director, Project on Mental Illness and Criminal Law, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis McGarry, M.D., Law and Medicine Center, University School of Medicine, Boston, Mass.

C. F. McNeil, Director, Social Welfare Assembly, New York, N.Y.

Herman G. Moeller, Assistant Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

James Murphy, Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Abraham G. Novick, Executive Director, Berkshire Farm for Boys, Canaan, N.Y.

Joshua Okun, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

Emery Olsen, Emeritus Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Russell Oswald, Chairman, New York State Parole Board, Albany, N.Y.

Asher R. Pacht, Chief, Clinical Services, Division of Corrections, Department of Public Welfare, Madison, Wis.

Mauris Platkin, M.D., Chief of Service, John Howard Pavilion, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Samuel Polsky, Professor of Law and Legal Medicine, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sanger Powers, Director, Division of Corrections, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare, Madison, Wis.

Ross Randolph, Director, Department of Public Safety, Springfield, Ill.

Ames Robey, M.D., Medical Director, Massachusetts Correctional Institute, Bridgewater, Mass.

Donald H. Russell, M.D., Director, Court Clinics Program, Division of Legal Medicine, Brookline, Mass.

Russell O. Settle, M.D., Director of Law and Psychiatry, Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.

Saleem A. Shah, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

E. Preston Sharp, Executive Secretary, American Correctional Association, Washington, D.C.

Charles Smith, M.D., Chief Medical Officer, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Heman Stark, Director, California State Youth Authority, Sacramento, Calif.

John A. Wallace, Director, New York City Office of Probation, New York, N.Y.

Russell L. Wilson, Board of Control, Des Moines, Ia.

Frederick Wiseman, Department of Sociology, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Drunkennes

H. David Archibald, Executive Director, Addiction Research Foundation, Toronto, Canada.

Leonard Blumberg, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sidney Cahn, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Michael Laski, Project Codirector, St. Louis Detoxification Center, St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis, Mo.

Rosemary Masters, Attorney, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, N.Y.

Frank Mateker, Captain, Director, Planning and Research Division, St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis, Mo.

Richard Merrill, Attorney, Washington, D.C.

John M. Murtagh, Justice, New York, Supreme Court, New York, N.Y.

Thomas Plaut, Assistant Chief, National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Earl Rubington, School of Alcohol Studies, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Irving Shandler, Director, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Thomas Shipley, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Walter Stanger, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Herbert J. Sturz, Director, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, N.Y.

Ralph F. Turner, Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Juvenile delinquency

Lisle C. Carter, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Individual and Family Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Forrest E. Conner, Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.

J. Dudley Diggs, Judge, LaPlata, Md.

Orman W. Ketcham, Judge, Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia.

James H. Lincoln, Judge, Juvenile Division, Detroit, Mich.

I. Richard Perlman, Chief, Juvenile Delinquency Studies Branch, Division of Research, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

George B. Raison, Jr., Judge, Chestertown, Md.

Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., Judge, Juvenile Court, Washington, D.C.

Bernard Russell, former Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Rosemary C. Sarri, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

James W. Symington, former Executive Director, President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

Philip B. Thurston, Judge, Family Court of New York, New York, N.Y.

Walter G. Whitlatch, Judge, Juvenile Court, Cleveland, Ohio.

Narcotics

David Acheson, Special Assistant to the Secretary (for Enforcement), Department of the Treasury.

Carl L. Anderson, Chief Program Consultant, Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental

Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dale C. Cameron, M.D., Superintendent, St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D.C.

David Deitch, Executive Director, Daytop Village, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Vincent P. Dole, M.D., Senior Physician and Professor, Rockefeller University, New York, N.Y.

John Enright, Assistant to the Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

John Finlator, Director, Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James H. Fox, Acting Chief, Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

George Gaffney, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

F. M. Garfield, Special Assistant to the Commissioner for Drug Abuse Control, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Francis Gearing, M.D., Research Unit, School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

Kenneth R. Lenington, Assistant to the Director for Regulatory Operations, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dean Markham, Special Assistant to the President, Great Lakes Carbon Corp., Washington, D.C. (deceased).

Aloysius J. Mella, Deputy Commissioner, Trials, New York City Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Donald S. Miller, Chief Counsel, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

Herbert S. Miller, Senior Research Attorney, Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

Henry E. Peterson, Chief, Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Robert Rasor, M.D., Medical Officer in Charge, U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky.

Richard J. Tatham, Chief of the Alcoholic and Drug Addiction Program, Development Office, D.C. Department of Health, Washington, D.C.

Organized crime

Julia Benson, Amherst, Mass.

Louis C. Cottell, Deputy Inspector, Central Intelligence Bureau, New York City Police Department, New York, N.Y.

William Duffy, Captain, Intelligence Division, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

Robert Herman, University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.

George Gaffney, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

William G. Hundley, Attorney, Falls Church, Va.

Aaron Kohn, Executive Director, Metropolitan Crime Commission, New Orleans, La.

Elliot Lumbard, Special Assistant to the Governor of New York for Law Enforcement, Albany, N.Y.

Henry E. Peterson, Chief, Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Virgil Peterson, Director, Chicago Crime Commission, Chicago, Ill.

Alfred Scotti, Chief Assistant District Attorney, New York County, New York, N.Y.

Harold E. Yarnell, Captain, Intelligence Division, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

Police

Claude Abercrombie, Jr., Sheriff, Douglass County, Douglassville, Ga.

Charles R. Adrian, Professor and Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of California, Riverside, Calif.

Douglass W. Ayres, City Manager, Salem, Oreg.

David A. Booth, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

C. Beverly Brily, Mayor, Nashville, Tenn.

Thomas Brownfield, Special Agent, Supervisor, FBI, Department of Justice.

Robert L. Carter, General Counsel, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York, N.Y.

Joseph Casper, Assistant Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

George E. Causey, Deputy Chief, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C.

Ben Clark, Sheriff, Riverside County, Calif.

Donald E. Clark, Sheriff, Multnomah County, Portland, Oreg.

James Cotter, Inspector in Charge, FBI National Academy, FBI, Department of Justice.

John Creer, County Commissioner, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Thompson S. Crockett, Professor of Police Science, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Fla.

Jerome Daunt, Chief, Uniform Crime Reporting Section, FBI, Department of Justice.

C. D. deLoach, Assistant to the Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

Leonard J. Duhl, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

Woodrow W. Dumas, Mayor, East Baton Rouge, La.

Edward L. Epting, Sergeant, San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco, Calif.

Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Officer, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice.

Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, Director, Washington Bureau, Office, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Washington, D.C.

Thomas F. Fitzpatrick, Director, Bureau of Special Services and Intelligence, San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco, Calif.

Arthur Q. Funn, General Counsel, National Urban League, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Charles R. Gain, Deputy Chief, Oakland Police Department, Oakland, Calif.

Robert R. J. Gallati, Director, New York State Intelligence and Identification System, Albany, N.Y.

Bernard Garmire, Chief of Police, Tucson, Ariz.

Peter F. Hagen, Inspector, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

William Harpole, Sheriff, Oktibbeha County, Starkville, Miss.

Patrick Healy, Executive Director, National League of Cities, Washington, D.C.

William W. Hermann, Police Consultant, Rand Corp., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

James C. Herron, Captain, Philadelphia Police Department, Philadelphia, Pa.

Roderic C. Hill, Lieutenant General, Adjutant General, California National Guard, Sacramento, Calif.

William Hollowell, Sheriff, Sunflower County, Indianola, Miss.

John E. Ingersoll, Chief of Police, Charlotte, N.C.

Adolph C. Jacobsmeier, Major, St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis, Mo.

John J. Jemilo, Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice.

Herbert T. Jenkins, Chief of Police, Atlanta, Ga.

Mark E. Keane, City Manager, Tucson, Ariz.

John T. Kelly, Deputy Chief of Police, Chicago, Ill.

Hubert O. Kemp, Chief of Police, Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn.

Floyd Mann, former Superintendent, Alabama Highway Patrol, Chambers County Sheriff's Office, Langdale Ala.

Daniel H. Margolis, Attorney, Washington, D.C.

Robert E. McCann, Director of Training, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

William P. McCarthy, Inspector, New York Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Roy McLaren, Director, Field Operations Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Karl A. Menninger, M.D., Chief of Staff, The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.

Raymond M. Mombosse, Deputy Attorney General, California Department of Justice, Sacramento, Calif.

William Mooney, Special Agent Supervisor, FBI, Department of Justice.

Patrick V. Murphy, Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice.

Joseph D. Nicol, Superintendent, Illinois Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, Joliet, Ill.

John F. Nichols, District Inspector, Detroit Police Department, Detroit, Mich.

Harvard Norred, Chief of Police, Gwinnett County, Lawrenceville, Ga.

Peter J. Pitchess, Sheriff, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

George H. Puddy, Executive Officer, California Police Officers' Standards and Training Commission, Sacramento, Calif.

Thomas Reddin, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rudy Sanfillippo, Task Force Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd G. Sealy, Assistant Chief Inspector, New York Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Carleton, F. Sharpe, City Manager, Kansas City, Mo.

Daniel J. Sharpe, Inspector, Rochester Police Department, Rochester, N.Y.

Robert Sheehan, Professor, Department of Law Enforcement Administration, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.

R. Dean Smith, Director, Research and Development Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Charles L. Southward, Brigadier General, Assistant Chief for Army National Guard, U.S. National Guard Bureau, Washington, D.C.

Daniel Stringer, Sheriff, Cherokee County, Canton, Ga.

Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Carl C. Turner, Major General Provost Marshal General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

William Veeder, City Manager, Charlotte, N.C.

Nelson A. Watson, Project Director, Research and Development Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Leon H. Weaver, Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

James Q. Wilson, Associate Professor of Government, Director, Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Minor Keith Wilson, Assistant Chief of Police, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

O. W. Wilson, Superintendent, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

Orrell A. York, Executive Director, Municipal Police Training Council, Albany, N.Y.

Science and technology

A. B. Cambel, Director, Research and Engineering Support Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

M. U. Clauser, Lincoln Laboratories, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

James Fletcher, President, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Eugene Fubini, Vice President, International Business Machines, Inc., Armonk, N.Y.
Jesse Orlansky, Research and Engineering Support Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Thomas Reddin, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

David Robinson, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

Robert Sproull, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
A. Tachmindji, Assistant Director, Research and Engineering Support Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

James Q. Wilson, Associate Professor of Government, Director, Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Implementation

Seymour S. Berlin, Director, Bureau of Inspections, Civil Service Commission.

Don L. Bowen, Executive Director, American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C.

Henry Cohen, First Deputy, Human Resources Administrator, New York, N.Y.

Morris W. H. Collins, Jr., Professor of Law, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Bernard L. Gladioux, Attorney, New York, N.Y.

Ferrel Heady, Director of Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

T. Norman Hurd, Budget Director, State of New York, Albany, N.Y.

Dwight Ink, Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Roger W. Jones, Special Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Herbert Kaufman, Professor, Department of Political Science, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Evelyn Murphy, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

William Pincus, Public Affairs Program, Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Randall B. Ripley, Research Associates, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Herbert Shepard, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office.

David T. Stanley, Member Senior Staff, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Robert Steadman, Director, Committee for Improvement in Government, Committee for Economic Development.

Frederick Wiseman, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

National officers

Sigurd S. Larmon, President.

Judge Caroline K. Simon, Chairman of the Board.

Jewett T. Flagg, Vice President.

Carl M. Loeb, Jr., Vice President.

Coverly Fischer, Treasurer.

Franklin F. Bruder, Chairman, Executive Committee.

Milton G. Rector, Director.

Board of trustees

Mrs. Julius Ochs Adler.

Myri E. Alexander.

J. David Baker.

Mrs. Curtis Bok.

Goodwin Chase.

Wilson Clark.

Bishop John P. Craine.

Tom Downs.

James E. Fain.

Curtiss E. Frank.

Richard L. Gelb.

Paul J. Gernert.

Judge Thomas D. Gill.

Joseph Griesedieck.

Edward Gudeman.

Miss Elizabeth Hallanan.

Garrett Heyns.

Harold Horvitz.

Peter Howard.

Mrs. Roy A. Hunt, Jr.

Mrs. David Jacobson.

Mrs. James A. King.

Lester K. Kirk.

Walter C. Laidlaw.

Joe E. Levitt.

Austin H. McCormick.

Pat Malloy.

Mrs. Ellen Pray Magtag.

George F. McGrath.

Louis Montag.

Russell Oswald.

Herbert Patterson.

H. Ladd Plumley.

Elizabeth Glenn Radvin, M.D.

Elmer W. Reeves.

Judge Scovel Richardson.

Mrs. H. M. Rozendaal.

Philip B. Schnering.

Mrs. Hobart A. Spalding.

Heman G. Stark.

Mrs. Maynard J. Toll.

Mrs. Arthur G. Whyte, Jr.

Randolph E. Wise.

Robert B. Wolf.

Hull Youngblood, Sr.

The release of April 30 from the Washington Evening Star follows:

CRIME PANEL WARNS OF CRISIS IN POLICE-MINORITY TIES—ACTION URGED TO AVERT RACIAL STRIFE IN CITIES

(By Ronald Sarro)

Drastic action is urgently needed to improve relations between police and minority groups in America, a National Crime Commission task force reported last night.

Without it, the task force said, there is a good chance that potentially explosive situations that now exist will mushroom and erupt into racial conflicts in a number of major cities.

The situation is being fueled by instances of police brutality, discrimination, and unethical conduct, and lack of public support and understanding of the role of police, the task force said.

Although police are aware of the problem and are beginning to take action to improve the situation, the report said, "progress is not nearly fast enough."

"LIKELY TO ACCELERATE"

"Impatience, frustration, and now violence are growing quickly in minority communities, and these trends are likely to accelerate," the presidential crime commission said.

The task force's findings, in a sense a warning, were reported in a 229-page supplement on police to the main crime commission report, made public earlier this year.

The commission plans to make public other task force reports on courts, corrections, juvenile delinquency, organized crime, science and technology, narcotics, drunks, as well as a general assessment.

Chairman Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, undersecretary of state, commented that "no single task is more urgent in confronting the challenge of crime than breaking down the wall of isolation that surrounds the police."

"To some extent the wall of isolation has been built by the rest of the community around the police; to some extent the wall is of the police's own making," he said.

HOSTILITY TO POLICE

As a result of studies, the commission found "serious problems of Negro hostility

to police in virtually all medium and large cities."

"Large numbers of minority group members see the police as their enemy who engage in verbal and physical abuse," the commission said.

The commission said its surveys also show that Negroes, who in Washington are the victims of 8 out of 10 crimes, "greatly desire better police protection."

"Consequently, there is every reason to believe that relations between the police and Negroes can be substantially improved," the task force said. The report added:

"However, the problem may be aggravated unless immediate steps are taken to improve police-community relations while America's cities are becoming more heavily populated by minority groups."

CITIES LISTED

In this respect, the task force listed Washington among cities with potentially dangerous situations. Washington has a population well over 60 percent Negro. Other cities in the category of growing large Negro populations and potentially explosive situations, the task force said, are:

Baltimore, Detroit, Newark, St. Louis, New Orleans, Atlanta, Memphis, Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati.

"The problems inherent in policing such cities by police forces comprised largely of white officers may become even worse if effective action is not taken," the commission said.

The Negro is not the only target of police discrimination and source of hostility. Puerto Rican and Mexican-American communities are experiencing similar trends, the task force said.

Many Negroes "see the police as protectors of the white people, not as protectors of the Negroes as well," the report said.

FEW ON POLICE FORCES

Substantially contributing to this situation, the report said, is the fact that "in every city, county and state where statistics are available, Negroes are underrepresented, usually substantially, on police forces."

In addition to this under representation, the report said, there is a widespread lack of success by Negroes in gaining promotion to supervisory ranks and in acquiring assignments as detectives.

Commission survey teams found instances of brutality, and verbal and physical abuse, in various police departments in which they spent from five to eight weeks riding with officers in high crime areas.

"Commission studies reveal that there are abuses in some cities which range from simple discourtesy to clearly unwarranted excessive use of force against persons of all ages," the report said.

In Washington, for example, the task force said, "offensive terms such as 'boy' or 'nigger' are too often used by officers of the department," often deliberately. Washington police recently banned use of such terms, with the specific exception of "boy."

POLICE VIEW

Police officers themselves view relations with the public as poor, the study showed, and in Washington, over half the Negroes and one quarter of the whites surveyed thought "many police enjoy giving people a hard time."

Yet, 8 out of 10 Negroes and whites believe that "there are just a few policemen who are responsible for the bad publicity."

The survey teams concluded that verbal abuse and harassment through discriminatory field interrogations, enforcement of minor statutes, and discourtesy, is the major police-community relations problem today, rather than physical abuse.

"Observers found that police officers began 15 percent of the interviews conducted by the police on the street with witnesses,

victims, suspects, and bystanders, with a brusque or discourteous command," the task force said.

"A survey of officers in several Northern cities found that almost three-quarters of the white officers expressed prejudice against Negroes," it said.

It placed importance on parity of minority representation on police departments, clear policies and leadership by police and political leaders, and all-out support for improvement programs by these officials.

Among remedies proposed were all-out community relations programs, firm commitments and programs to recruit minority members to police departments, development of strong neighborhood advisory groups, more intense police training, and "improvement of police complaint procedures by welcoming complaints. . . ."

The task force hit at unwarranted uses of firearms it found, noting this is a riot stimulus, and criticized use of police dogs for civil rights demonstrations, crowd control, and routine patrol in minority areas.

SURVEY CITED

But even with hostility arising from use of dogs, the task force, citing Negro concern over crime said a survey in Washington showed 46 percent of the Negro men and 60 percent of the Negro women favored more use of dogs, prudently, for routine patrols.

"Public antagonism harms police work, thereby making it more difficult to recruit officers, to keep them on the force and to have them work effectively" the task force said.

THE SEATING OF CONGRESSMAN ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have before it again the vexing question of whether to seat ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

Those who rejected the committee report on March 1 in that memorable 222-to-202 vote and went on to their inexorable expulsion conclusion in House Resolution 278, have seen demonstrated what was forewarned, in that Mr. POWELL returns as the overwhelming choice again of his district.

The special election cost the city of New York \$93,986, a charge that should be assumed by this Congress.

The community newspaper in my area, Manhattan East, in its well-known column "The Least East" by Rick Friedman, which comments on the passing scene, has analyzed in devastating fashion the situation that now faces us.

Reading this column, which I commend to my colleagues, can only bring home to us the sagacity of the members of the select committee in their House Report No. 27 in which they recommended seating subject to penalties.

The column follows:

THE LEAST EAST—THE HOUSE HUNTER (By Rick Friedman)

President Nelson A. Rockefeller, in his State of the Union Message this morning before Congress, pleaded with the House of Representatives to admit Adam Clayton Powell permanently. The move, he said, was

imperative to keep his native state from going bankrupt because of the special elections it has been forced to call every three or four months since 1967.

The President, who narrowly squeaked into office this past November over Lurleen Wallace by throwing his full support to the *Seat Powell Bloc*, pointed out that the 14 special elections held by the Empire State since Powell's first expulsion from Congress six years ago has cost New York State millions. Also, that it has seriously impeded the state from full support of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam-Cambodian-Laos-Thailand-Singapore War.

President Rockefeller's plea to the House brought a sharp blast from Rep. Curtis (R-Mo.), leader of the *Keep Powell Out Bloc*. Rep. Curtis denounced Rockefeller, claiming that New York State could easily support both the Vietnam-Cambodia-Laos-Thailand-Singapore War and all the special elections Powell forced on it by merely cutting down on its welfare rolls.

He added that it was totally untrue that the *Keep Powell Out Bloc* has finally run out of candidates willing to run against Powell in New York's 18th Congressional District to which the Harlem Congressman was elected again in November, unseated again in December, and re-elected still again in a special election last week.

Rep. Curtis stunned the press gathered on the Capitol steps by revealing that Count Basie has been persuaded to throw his hat in the 18th Congressional District ring. Curtis said Basie was a top favorite in Harlem.

As with the other 20 candidates (counting special and regular elections) who have lost to Powell since the House unseated him in 1967, Basie isn't given much of a chance of beating the Harlem Oustercrat.

Located later today in a Manhattan recording studio by an Associated Press reporter, Basie said he first considered running against Powell when Powell's fifth straight golden record, *Fiddler on the Floor*, went ahead of his own new record on the national sales charts.

Basie was reminded that Powell never leaves Bimini to campaign and still wins reelection each time by a landslide. He responded by revealing for the first time that he has appointed Bob Price as his campaign manager. And that Price has come up with a surefire way to beat the Harlem Oustercrat. If enough campaign funds can be raised from the *Keep Powell Out Bloc*, Price plans to take all the eligible Harlem voters he can to Bimini and set them up two weeks each in store fronts there.

The announcement of Basie's candidacy has sent the country once more into what has become its favorite trivia game: trying to remember the names of all 20 candidates who have run and lost to Powell in the 18th Congressional District of New York since 1967. The more well-known were:

John Lindsey, who gambled in 1968 that a win in the 18th would project him into the national Presidential picture—and lost.

Lester Maddox, who opened a Chicken Delight in Harlem in 1971 after his one term as Georgia Governor. He disappeared about half-way through his Harlem Congressional campaign that year and was never seen or heard from again.

Hubert Humphrey, who in 1971 was brought from the complete obscurity of his Lennox Avenue drug store to make the race against Powell and regain his national image. Humphrey is now back in his Lennox Avenue drug store.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was convinced in 1969 by the *Keep Powell Out Bloc* that Harlem needed him. He found out it didn't.

Richard M. Nixon, who, in the memorable press conference that touched off the Great Harlem Riot of August, 1970, accused report-

ers from the *Amsterdam News* of giving him the shaft.

William Buckley, who spent his whole 1972 campaign on the beaches of Bimini debating Powell.

Powell, who has been in seclusion the past few days, held his regular Tuesday press conference on the Bimini docks this afternoon. He was reminded by newsmen that the last Congressional vote in December, 1972, was a close 214-211 to keep him out of Congress again. Powell blamed the closeness of the vote on new, young Congressmen from underdeveloped urban areas who have been coming into the House in recent years and siding with the *Seat Powell Bloc*.

He said he agreed with Stokely Carmichael head of the National Negro Renaissance Party, that his [Powell's] *instinct* would be a serious blow to Black Power. Also, that such a move would badly upset his daily Congressional routine in Bimini by forcing him to appear occasionally in Washington.

The Harlem Oustercrat revealed that he was even considering the possibility of bringing to light sometime in 1973 a few still-unknown misdeeds he committed before his first ouster from the House six years ago. This, he claimed, could insure his being kept out of Congress until at least 1980.

Regular Bimini beat reporters at the Tuesday conference appeared, as usual, in bathing suits. They expressed the fear that Powell's potential *instinct* could force them all back to covering accidents and fires in the States.

They urged Powell to make the revelations on himself, and then they accepted his standing Tuesday offer to take them fishing on his boat.

INSURANCE AND WELFARE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see a recent editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Insurance and Welfare." It points out in a very thorough fashion that the social security program today is shot through with problems involving inequity and plain poor financing.

One of the most important points the Post makes is that the old-age and survivors insurance program has become "neither an insurance nor a welfare program but a mixture of both." The drift of social security toward becoming a welfare program is clearly evident today, and the Post does a fine job of emphasizing that a distinction must be made between retirement annuities and welfare benefits.

I call this particular editorial to the attention of the House because it is typical of the scholarly and objective treatment of economic issues which the Post has produced recently. It is a rare commodity in American journalism today.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point the Washington Post editorial of April 2, 1967:

INSURANCE AND WELFARE

Mr. Walter Reuther, the president of the United Automobile Workers, touched off some sparks of controversy when he told the House Ways and Means Committee "that we will never build an adequate social security struc-

ture so long as we rely exclusively for the financing of that structure upon the payroll tax." He urges that one third of the costs of the Social Security programs be contributed by the Federal Government from general funds, thus reducing the shares contributed by employers and employees. Unlike most statements on Social Security emanating from the labor movement, Mr. Reuther's points in the right direction. But it falls utterly in getting at the roots of the matter, in explaining what is really wrong with the Old Age and Survivors Insurance program.

The trouble is that the OASI is neither an insurance nor a welfare program but a mixture of both which discriminates against young people in favor of the old, against married women who work and against the working poor. Before these charges can be elucidated, one important point must be made. It is customary to speak of the employer's part of the OASI tax—half of the 7.7 per cent on the first \$6600 of income—as if it were a gift to the insured. But that is a delusion. Sooner or later, the burden of the employers' tax is shifted to wage and salary earners in the shape of higher prices or lower wages, fewer jobs or lower dividends.

Viewed as a retirement annuity, OASI is a bad bargain. Prof. Colin D. Campbell of Dartmouth College illustrates the point with the case of the young man who begins work at 22 and continues for 43 years, at the 1966 tax rates and the increases in payments scheduled through 1973, his contributions with accumulated interest at 4 per cent over the 43 years would amount to more than \$67,000. When the probable survivors and disability insurance benefits are eliminated, the value of the accumulated taxes for retirement benefits is reduced to about \$50,000, out of which the Government will pay \$3000 per year for the average life expectancy of 14 years. But the same pension or annuity could be financed with accumulated tax payments of only \$33,000 or by premium payments to a private insurance company amounting to about \$45,000.

What happens to the surplus? Much of it is used to confer windfalls upon the already retired whose benefits far exceed their contributions.

There are other inequities. The poor boy who begins work at 17 instead of 22 receives no more benefits for the extra five years of taxes paid, and since the life expectancy of the poor is lower, he may take less out in benefits. Benefits to the working wives of insured husbands are sharply reduced, even though, they make the same tax contributions. If the Social Security program continues to operate as it does now, there will be sharp increases in the regressive payroll taxes and even greater discrimination against the young and the poor. This disquieting drift can be stopped by recognizing the distinction between retirement annuities and welfare benefits. The former are purchased by workers, and the costs should not exceed the promised benefits. Welfare benefits should be based upon current needs, not past income, and the best way to extend them to the aged is through a negative income tax.

FARM CONTROL SHOULD TAPER OFF

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to see that Life magazine supports my efforts and that of many others to

get the Federal Government out of the business of farming.

It has become clear that the world shortage of food—so long predicted—is finally upon us, Life points out. The editorial notes the efforts of the American Farm Bureau Federation to straighten out the mess the Government and the farmer are in.

In these days of world food shortage, Farm Bureau President Charles Shuman is gaining important allies.

Life reports, and then describes my bill, H.R. 7326, which would, among other things, end grain acreage allotments and subsidies allowing the free market to set prices.

As the world's needs for food becomes greater—

Life concludes—

the day is bound to come—and soon—when all of America's farm capacity will be needed. Anticipating that day, our farm programs should be allowed to taper off so that they can be finally eliminated and prices can be set fairly by the open market.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point the Life editorial of March 31, 1967:

FARM CONTROLS CAN TAPER OFF

In 25 states, members of the radical National Farmers Organization are dumping milk down the drain rather than sell it for a low of 8¢ a quart.

In a month, 60,000 bred sows and cows have been sold off to slaughter in an attempt to shrink the future supply of meat.

Delegates to the annual convention of the 250,000-member National Farmers Union voted a moratorium on purchases of all new equipment and autos.

In these ways, and a dozen others, farmers are trying to force increases in the prices they get for what they produce. It is impossible to talk about an "average farm" in an industry that ranges from 10 acres and a mule in Appalachia to corporate ranches in Texas. But across the country farm prices are stagnant, expenses are up and, according to Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, "Farm income is far too low." He added, "I won't be satisfied until per capita farm income, now at \$1,731, has climbed to nonfarm levels, presently at \$2,618 per capita."

The farmers scented a new day coming when, last year, the U.S. reversed a policy that had existed since the 1930s—and called for the first peacetime increase in farm acreage. It had suddenly become clear that the world shortage of food—so long predicted—was finally upon us. A quarter of our wheat crop went to just one country, India, and surpluses whose size had been a scandal seven years ago dwindled below the safe reserve level.

On the farms, expectations went up but prices didn't. American farmers today are paid about the same for their crops as they were in 1956. In the meantime, everything that a farmer has to buy—from mortgage money to machinery—has spiraled up with the cost of living.

Many farmers blame their predicament on the federal government—and claim that the intricate system of subsidies and allotments is geared to keep prices down and housewives happy. The accusation may not be fair, but statistics support the fact that housewives who spent 25% of their family's disposable income on food 20 years ago now spend only 18%.

Secretary Freeman has told farmers that better cooperation among themselves is their one best weapon in the fight to raise their incomes to parity with those of all other Americans. In a speech to the National

Farmers Union, Freeman said, "Farmers have power—if they act together." But unity among farmers is probably a forlorn hope—as evidenced by the variety of programs offered by three major farm organizations.

The National Farmers Organization, a brash new group that has signed up an estimated quarter of a million members, would raise prices by decreasing supplies that reach the market. The N.F.O. is behind the campaigns to sell off bred sows and to dump milk. No such campaign can work unless it commands a majority of producers—and the N.F.O. represents a small minority of all farmers. The threat of violence among farmers is implicit in such minority boycotts—as attempts are made to force the majority to join in.

The National Farmers Union, with its greatest support on the smaller family farms, favors most government benefits and would in fact tighten up programs and raise price supports. But the N.F.U. also dreamed up the hapless campaign to put off buying equipment or autos until crop prices rise.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, largest and most conservative of all the farmers' groups, has one simple answer to all its members' ills: get the government out of farming.

In these days of world food shortage, Farm Bureau President Charles Shuman is gaining important allies. Representative Thomas Curtis (Rep.—Missouri) has introduced a bill in Congress that would make the Farm Bureau plan law. Under the bill, grain acreage allotments and subsidies would be ended—and the free market would set prices. According to the Farm Bureau, the wisdom of its members would make such a system work. They would simply adjust their output to the needs of the nation and the world. That would take some doing, considering the vagaries of weather, the world market and the farmers' own past record in not working together.

Secretary Freeman counters Shuman's plan with a projection—supported by economists at nine universities—that the abrupt ending of controls would cut farm income an average of 30%.

But as the world's need for food becomes greater, the day is bound to come—and soon—when all of America's farm capacity will be needed. Anticipating that day, our farm programs should be allowed to taper off so that they can be finally eliminated and prices can be set fairly by the open market.

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT DEALT LOW, LOW BLOW BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is faced with the serious decision about continuing the administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs as they are. The administration is exerting a great deal of pressure on Members of Congress to support the programs as they stand. The administration is actively seeking the support of educational lobbyists around the country.

The administration is nervous about passage of its legislation. And well they might be. Experience has proven that the program does not work as well as it was

supposed to. Local school districts are suffering under the present Federal education programs.

I have joined with the distinguished Representative from Minnesota, ALBERT QUIE, in supporting significant amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I strongly urge the Members of the House to support the Quie amendments as a means of strengthening education in America.

Let me share with you a letter from a local school district superintendent in my district. This letter was sent several days ago to the U.S. Office of Education in response to their "semiform letter" denying Federal funds for an educational project under title III of ESEA.

Note in the letter that this school superintendent was a supporter of the special, categorical Federal aid to education programs. But, now, with bitter, practical experience in these programs, he has changed his mind. He writes:

As of now I am firmly convinced that general aid is the only way to go. Only the local board, the local administration, with the help of their respective faculties, can define what needs to be done.

The kind of changes proposed by the Quie amendments, are exactly what this school superintendent is talking about.

I have withheld the name of this courageous school superintendent, for his own protection. Here is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. —: Having had advance notice that funds for Title III of the ESEA were to be curtailed, your letter of April 14 comes as no great surprise. Inadequate funding is something that every Superintendent has learned to live with. Had your letter simply stated this fact, I doubt that I would have bothered to even respond to your notification that this District's project had been rejected. The manner in which your office chose to reject this project is, however, offensive and very much resented. In place of your lengthy list of alleged reasons for rejection, you might better have said that we are a bunch of incompetents that don't know what we are doing.

Our project is so fundamental that we should have anticipated that the many pseudo experts doing the proof reading would miss the import of this project for the pupils it was intended to serve. We started with a simple fact, namely, that the terminal students in every school district are woefully deficient in the basic communication and computation skills. These youngsters have been exposed to English and mathematics every year and have still managed to acquire a minimal facility with these basic skills.

Our second premise was equally simple, that expertise exists that could be brought to bear on this problem. Through a systems approach, objectives would be defined and materials developed that would provide a completely new approach to the teaching of these skills.

Ours was no idle dream. We have seen what Lytton Industries was able to do in developing a systems approach to teaching science in the junior high. To state that the objectives would be difficult to measure, that procedures are not adequately stated, that the innovative aspects are questionable, is to expose your ignorance regarding the systems approach to achieving a stated goal.

Prior to submitting this project, this District spent many man hours in researching

and developing this project. We consulted with State vocational experts, who saw great potential in this project. We met endlessly with our own LAPACE Committee who endorsed this project as something that needed to be done, and as something that had wide application. After all this, we get a semi-form letter that tells us we don't know what we are doing. We have reached a pretty sad state of affairs where a project that could help 50% of the high school pupils on a nationwide basis is deemed to be "inappropriate."

When I look at the approved projects here in Los Angeles County, my blood boils. Our project did not contain inflated administrative salaries or exorbitant clerical salaries nor did it seek to set up a self-perpetuating empire. I guess we just haven't learned the name of the game yet, for we are still plodding along trying to help pupils.

This District has benefited greatly in past years through the various special Federal programs. When I listened to people debate the merits of general versus categorical aid, I was merely a passive listener. You, however, have made a convert of me. As of now I am firmly convinced that general aid is the only way to go. Only the local Board, and the local administration, with the help of their respective faculties, can define what needs to be done. The multi-bureaucracy being developed at both State and Federal levels seems destined to be staffed by educational misfits that have both feet firmly planted in mid air. With the careful (?) screening given by these various offices to future applications, it is doubtful that a project aimed at fundamental problems or basic needs will ever be approved.

I am not in the habit of writing letters when angry. I purposefully deferred this reply for two whole days after receipt of your letter to allow for a lowering of both blood pressure and temperature. I find, however, that the more I think of this the angrier I get. I feel so strongly about the manner in which I see Title III being administered that I am sending copies of this to both our State and Federal elected representatives. This letter may not change their views regarding Title III, but they will at least know that the 1800 square miles of geography known as Antelope Valley thinks we've been dealt a low, low blow.

Yours truly,

District Superintendent.

THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing feeling that in combating the ills of the poor, there are alternatives to the mere expansion of present poverty programs.

I believe alternatives are possible which can accomplish the desired goals effectively and at less cost to the taxpayer than would otherwise be the case.

I had the opportunity to discuss this point in a symposium titled "A Discussion of Great Society Programs," sponsored by the council of graduate students at the Ohio State University on April 5, 1967 in Columbus, Ohio. I was privileged to share the platform with Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, of Minnesota; Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard

economist and former Ambassador to India, and Dr. Seymour Lipset, the noted Harvard sociologist.

For the information of my colleagues, I am submitting for the RECORD the text of my remarks:

THE GREAT SOCIETY—A CRITIQUE AND ALTERNATIVE

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States during the past two centuries has achieved the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Despite this fact, many individual Americans today do not share the fruits of our nation's great economic progress. Thus the problem of improving the living conditions of these underprivileged is, and has been, one of our country's most pressing domestic issues.

Many economists define poverty as income per family of \$3,000 a year or less. In this context, using 1964 constant dollars as a standard, it is evident that during the past eighteen years significant strides have been made in the struggle against deprivation. In 1947, 31 percent of the families in the United States had incomes of less than \$3,000. By 1964, only 18 per cent of the families fell below this figure. This remarkable decrease was accomplished through the combined efforts of industry, government, and private organizations pursuing the joint goals of economic progress and the elimination of poverty, not by massive employment in the public sector of the economy.

Although substantial economic progress has been made, it is important to examine critically the nature of this progress and the poverty "pockets" which still exist. From this analysis, several facts are evident.

First, the reduction rate of the total percentage of Americans living in poverty has slowed in recent years (only 4 percent since 1956).

Second, overall advancement is further marred by the finding that certain groups of our population have not made any economic advancement and, in some cases, have become even further entrenched in poverty status. The number of families, for instance, with five or more children who live in poverty has remained constant at about 1.1 million. The number of poor households headed by females actually increased from 1959 to 1964.

Third, although the total number of poor, non-white households declined by 200,000 between 1959 and 1964, it still is important to note that in 1964 almost 48 percent of the non-white families were below the poverty-income level of \$3,000.

What accounts for these poverty "pockets" in an era of "plenty"?

Some families—through physical disability or old age—never will be able to earn higher incomes. As a matter of conscience, those without physical earning power deserve a minimum standard of living.

Other poor households have low earning power because their heads lack skills. In other instances, existing skills have not been sufficient to overcome the barriers of prejudice. Women, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans, in particular, frequently are paid less than male whites employed in the same occupations.

Unfortunately, low earning power is not the only problem of the poor. Insecurity and dependence although less easily measured, generate an apathy which becomes a major obstacle to the acquiring of skills. This apathy frequently is passed along from generation to generation.

Throughout our history, normal economic progress has diminished the number of poverty-stricken household. However, it seems likely that some of the remaining poor may be unable to extricate themselves without unusual assistance. Families which have lived in our cities on welfare since the days of the Great Depression, or even before,

families that have remained on subsistence farms or on meager cash-crop tenant farms in the South or the Great Plains, and families that have migrated to the cities but failed to get ahead—these families have not shared in our nation's growing economic abundance.

Many have lost self-initiative. Instead, they have become accustomed to letting others make decisions for them. Even more distressing, these persons may be too discouraged and apathetic to respond to the rhetoric of outsiders.

Fundamentally, most Americans prefer a wide range of choice for individuals and a carefully defined, limited role for government. Today, however, as in the 1930's the public desires a faster social improvement than self-help and private initiative can give. Again, as in the Great Depression, the present Administration has embarked on an administrative response from Washington.

II. THE GREAT SOCIETY APPROACH

The federal poverty program, initiated with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (PL88-452, August 20, 1964), was intended to assist in raising living standards for the country's very poor. The purpose clause of the Act states:

"The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this nation by opening to everyone the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy."

The Economic Opportunity Act authorized six major categories of programs: youth programs, community action programs, special programs for rural areas, employment and investment incentives, work-experience programs, and VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America).

Combined with this approach are state and local welfare systems, a farm price support plan initiated more than thirty years ago, and various new programs either administered from Washington or directed locally under terms established by Congress and enforced by federal agencies.

The number of different regulations and agencies involved almost defies comprehension. For example, a recent article in the *Atlantic Monthly* declared that today no one knows for certain how many federal domestic programs actually exist today. Specific estimates range from one hundred and twenty to two hundred and thirty-six. The Bureau of the Budget does not even try to count them, relying, instead, upon the estimates of the Library of Congress. Thus, the Budget Director, Charles Schultze, recently described his plight when he testified before a Senate subcommittee. He stated that in 1965 and 1966 Congress passed 21 new health programs, 17 new educational programs, 15 new economic development programs, 12 new programs to meet the problems of our cities, 4 new manpower training programs, and 17 new resource development programs.

In an appearance before the same subcommittee, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner, gave a frank picture of the inadequacy of the present governmental apparatus. He spoke in terms of "good management" and of getting "100 cents on the taxpayer's dollar". "In that spirit", he continued, "let's look at our problems candidly. In almost every domestic program we are encountering crises of organization. Coordination among Federal agencies leaves much to be desired. Communication between the various levels of government—Federal, State, and local—is casual and ineffective. State and local gov-

ernment is in most areas seriously inadequate".

Secretary Gardner indicated that reforms in the federal system are necessary in order to attain better administration of domestic programs. "But", he cautioned, "we have a long, long way to go". This observation pin-points the dilemma confronting our nation today. The rational of government action in the poverty problem stems from the private sector's inability to remedy the situation more rapidly. Now one of our most important federal officials properly warns us not to expect too much of the government, either.

III. WEAKNESSES OF THE PRESENT POVERTY APPROACHES

All of us, I am certain, share the Administration's goal of eliminating poverty. Nevertheless, there is a hopeless gap between Administration aims and its ability to achieve them.

Let me cite seven major weaknesses inherent in the present approach. Four of these relate to the adverse effect on the poor themselves. The other three represent general program defects.

First, the present approach restricts the individual's freedom of choice, thus providing the poor with the wrong incentives. For instance, when a person on welfare tries to improve his situation by accepting a part-time or seasonal job, his benefits are reduced by an amount corresponding to the pay he receives. This, in effect, is a *one hundred percent marginal tax rate*. Thus, the welfare recipient gains nothing by trying to work.

Similarly, the "means tests," commonly imposed throughout the United States, discourages savings on the part of a person who, upon securing temporary employment, leaves the welfare roles. If he loses his job—and it is important to remember that the least skilled are the first to be dismissed in a recession—he must dissipate most of his savings before he is eligible for further welfare assistance. Thus, he gained nothing by trying to save.

Even worse, the family unit, the very basis of our society, is undermined by the so-called "man in the house" provision of our federal Aid for Dependent Children program. Because of this requirement, an unskilled father often can best provide for his youngsters by deserting them.

Still another perverse incentive is found in the approach to poverty by public housing authorities. When an individual receives a pay raise, his family no longer is eligible for public housing. However, this salary increase may be more than offset by the higher rents paid to owners of private housing units. Consequently, unless he can secure an enormous pay boost—large enough to compensate him for higher private rents—the poor person is wiser if he seeks no raise at all.

From the foregoing, it is evident that, under the present system, the low-income person is discouraged from trying to work, from trying to save, from trying to support his family, and from trying to obtain a better job.

Second, the present approach to poverty is limited in its coverage. Professor James Tobin, who was on the Council of Economic Advisers when the War on Poverty was devised, recently described the "bewildering variety of welfare and social insurance programs". He stated flatly: "... half of the poor benefit from none of these; and most of the public money spent to supplement personal incomes goes to families above the poverty line".

Another sobering observation was conveyed by the noted economist, Eli Ginzberg. He estimated that Federal poverty programs in 1966 reached only one in ten of the poor.

Third, under present procedures, the beneficiary is personally dependent on local officials. In most programs, the burden of proof

is upon the applicant. The deserted mother must *prove* that her children's father has left home for good. The welfare recipient must *prove* that he fails the means test. This puts the fate of the poor person in the hands of specific people against whom there is little recourse, little right of appeal. The psychological effects created by this, personal dependency are adverse, to say the least.

Fourth, because of this administrative approach, uncertainty exists. A program may be undertaken, raise the hopes of the apathetic, and then be cut off without recourse. This recently occurred in my hometown of Dayton (Ohio). Last month, four community action programs, established in 1966, were declared "low-priority" by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The phasing-out of these locally-initiated projects has dashed the aspirations of those whom they were designed to help. It will be difficult to start again at some later date in a poverty-stricken neighborhood which has experienced this kind of discouragement.

These last two problems—dependence and uncertainty—are not personal or partisan. They are inherent in the administrative approach to poverty. To avoid these evils, we will need a new approach, not just new people in charge.

Fifth, as pointed out by Michael D. Reagan, Professor of Political Science at the University of California (Riverside), structural approaches take longer to eliminate the causes of poverty. Thus, as Professor Reagan states: "The full benefit of Project Head Start . . . will not be reaped until the children enrolled in 1965 finish high school in 1978". Professor Reagan concludes by stating: "It is now evident that our greatest immediate need is a way to provide additional income quickly, both as a goal in itself and as a way of enabling the families of the poor to provide an atmosphere conducive to the effectiveness of the programs aimed at helping their children".

A sixth difficulty with our current governmental approach to the problems of poverty is its uneven applicability in different regions of the country. In this connection, two basic weaknesses are evident. (A) The present system relies on the depressed and under-developed areas of the country to support our rural poor. (B) Even when state efforts are largely financed through federal funds, wide differences exist throughout the fifty states. For example, the federal program for Aid to Families of Dependent Children allows the states to determine both local need and what percentage of that need is to be met through welfare payments. In 1961, according to a study cited by Professor Tobin, a five-state region extending from Kentucky to Mississippi estimated need at only eighty percent of the need figure established by states in the Middle Atlantic region. Then these five southern states supplied funds in an amount which met only sixty percent of the computed need standard. Since the Middle Atlantic states met their goals, dependent children in the aforementioned five southern states were receiving less than half as much as American youngsters in another region.

This, in turn, instigates another set of perverse incentives. The most energetic people in the poorer regions of our nation tend to migrate to cities in the North and East to obtain better paying jobs. Those transients whose skills fail to meet the requirements of industry, then have two choices. They either can remain in the metropolis, or they can return home. Since urban communities provide higher levels of welfare payments, the former alternative inevitably is selected. Low income families, therefore, tend to congregate in metropolitan centers.

This immobility pattern elevates per capita welfare costs. Support of low-income families residing in urban areas involves

higher rent payments, greater food costs, and more costly service expenditures.

Seventh, an administrative response to poverty tends to perpetuate programs beyond an appropriate terminal date. Throughout the United States there are many well-intentioned anti-poverty officials whose salaries exceed those of local mayors and appointed city and state administrators. Their pay, in most instances, is greater than that received when employed in the private sector of the economy. In fact, the Office of Economic Opportunity has a higher proportion of executives with salaries over \$10,000 annually than any similar federal agency.

No one wants to lose the best job he ever had. Consequently, it is hard to conceive that this bureaucracy would disband automatically if, for instance, all households attained a three thousand dollar annual income level. In view of this, might it not be safer, faster, and even less costly to establish a system which would bypass this bureaucracy and assist the poor directly?

On July 30, 1966, the highly-respected *Christian Science Monitor* made this evaluation of the "War on Poverty":

"In its first year and a half of chasing after cures for poverty, the administration's 'economic opportunity' program has come up practically empty-handed . . . Most of the approaches have little of substance to show for the \$2.5 billion effort. This is especially true of the community-action programs, which require a tenuous cooperation among many groups at the community level".

This failure can be attributed largely to the seven previously-cited weaknesses in our current programs designed to bridge the poverty gap.

IV. WHAT ARE POSITIVE ALTERNATIVES

Action against poverty is a worthwhile national endeavor. Structural programs of proven efficacy, such as Head Start, should be strengthened. Ineffective and marginal programs should be abandoned or overhauled.

Further, President Johnson stated in his February 28, 1967 Message on Education and Health: we should continue to "provide equality of educational opportunity to all Americans—to give every child education of the highest quality, no matter how poor his family, how great his handicap, what color his skin, or where he lives". Likewise, discrimination in hiring and housing must be eliminated if the poverty cycle is to be broken.

However, expanding federal expenditures to erect a new bureaucracy to determine how further benefits should be distributed to the poor merely will compound presently existing errors. Further, it seems to me that this administrative approach, which breeds among the poor dependency and insecurity, is morally wrong.

Instead, it is my conclusion that the Negative Income Tax would be the most effective means by which the federal government can commit further resources in the battle against poverty.

My proposal is simple and direct. In the last few years, millions of our citizens have benefited from reductions in federal income tax rates. The only Americans who have not gained directly from tax reductions have been the poor—those who pay little or no income tax. Instead of increasing federal spending for the indirect benefit of the poor, I propose that they be helped directly by a return of federal revenues.

V. WHAT IS A NEGATIVE INCOME TAX?

How would a Negative Income Tax work? It would return federal revenue directly to the poor and give them the same right to spend for their own good that earlier tax cuts gave to American taxpayers. Under our present tax structure, a deduction of six hundred dollars is allowed each member of the family. Additional deductions are

granted for old age, disability, and for certain medical expenses. The taxpayer then relates his deductions to his gross income. If this income is greater than permissible deductions, he pays a tax on the net amount.

Suppose, however, that the family's income is less than its total of allowable deductions. In these circumstances no tax is paid. Under a Negative Income Tax system, that family would receive from the federal government a percentage of the amount by which income is exceeded by total deductions.

The specific Negative Income Tax plan which I would like to present for your consideration was developed by the Ripon Society, a Republican research and policy organization with chapters across the country. Under the provisions of the Ripon proposal a family of four would receive some degree of assistance if its total income amounted to \$5,500, or less, per year.

Let's give a specific illustration. Assume a family of four received a pre-tax income of \$2,500 in a given year. This family would receive monthly payments equivalent to half the deficiency existing between its \$2,500 income and the break-off point of \$5,500. One-half of this \$3,000 difference is, of course, \$1,500 a year. So, after a Negative Income Tax rebate, this family's income would total \$4,000 a year—\$2,500 plus the \$1,500 received from the Internal Revenue Department.

Now let us suppose that the head of this family received a ten dollar per week pay raise. This would elevate total family income to \$3,020 a year. The difference between this sum and \$5,500 is \$2,480. The family's tax refund—one-half of this differential—would be \$1,240. This rebate, when added to earned income of \$3,020, means a total family income of \$4,260. This approach thus provides an earning incentive lacking in present welfare plans.

As just outlined, the Negative Income Tax plan would cost \$11 billion a year. There would be \$1 billion less taxes collected and \$10 billion paid out directly.

I estimate that the budget deficit for fiscal year 1968 will be between \$17 billion and \$20 billion. Thus, it is not practical at this time to think in terms of expanding this deficit by an additional \$11 billion. However, one of the advantages of a Negative Income Tax system is that it permits gradual implementation.

Therefore, it could be initiated this year at a cost of \$2 billion on the basis of the government meeting one-tenth, rather than one-half, of each family's income deficiency. As the weaknesses of the program were observed and eliminated, the percent could be increased. Finally, upon cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, the maximum 50 percent level could be invoked. The \$11 billion annually which this would involve, would still be less than one-half that amount now allocated to our military effort in Vietnam.

VI. ADVANTAGES OF THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

I would expect eight major benefits to accrue from the adoption by Congress of a Negative Income Tax plan. First, there would be full coverage. All of those in the poverty category would benefit, not just the few. There would be no leakage to those farmers or senior citizens in the high-income brackets. Poor rural families would benefit as much as poor urban ones. In short, the unorganized poor would be helped as much as the organized.

Second, the dependence of the poor on case workers and other government officials would be greatly reduced. The psychological boost should be tremendous. By freeing the poor from a sense that their lives are ruled by others against whom there is no appeal, we begin to make headway against the apathy which tends to keep people poor.

Third, the insecurity to which I referred in connection with the Dayton poverty programs would also be eliminated. No Con-

gressional dispute, administrative decree, or Presidential budget-cutting would threaten people benefitting from a Negative Income Tax.

Fourth, individual and family incentives would improve immediately. The perverseness inherent in present welfare programs would be minimized. Under a Negative Income Tax system a person about to take a job would know he could keep half of his earnings, instead of losing them all as formerly.

Fifth, instead of promoting a bureaucracy with an open-ended vested interest, the Negative Income Tax would be self-liquidating. As the poor acquire skills and increased earning capacity, their negative taxes would decline.

Sixth, the Negative Income Tax would promote geographical balance, thus alleviating the regional disparities which exist under present welfare programs. Those receiving Negative Income Tax refunds could move anywhere in the country for work or retirement. Unsuccessful migrants to our major cities could return home without being penalized by reduced welfare benefits. The purchasing power thus generated in the nation's distressed areas would attract business investment and create additional jobs.

Seventh, the Negative Income Tax would promote a more balanced federal system. As state and local governments adjust to the new tax, they can shift their general welfare spending to those areas of greatest need. The principal advantage arising from this lies in the fact that needs peculiar to a locality normally are most quickly spotted and most efficiently corrected by local authorities.

Eighth, the Negative Income Tax will promote a better market economy. As an economist and as a Republican, I firmly believe that a market economy is vital to a healthy democracy. It disperses spending power, decentralizes decision-making, and gives the individual a wide range of choices. As stated in the forthcoming April 1967, issue of *The Ripon Forum*: "The experience of buying freely in a money economy is an important factor in developing the self-reliance and confidence that many poor people lack. The Republican Party has long recognized the role the free market can play in enriching people's lives and efficiently satisfying their needs. Must the poor—just because they are poor—be excluded from this part of American life?"

VII. ANSWERS TO ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

Despite the manifest advantages of a Negative Income Tax, some still express doubts regarding its efficacy. I shall consider two of the most frequently heard objections.

First, some are afraid that the recipients of Negative Income Tax rebates will lose the incentive to work. A respected House Republican colleague of mine stated last December: "... it would break the link between income and work. It would perpetuate welfare as a way of life". Unfortunately, the link between income and work has long since been broken for welfare recipients. As illustrated previously, these people have been living in a one hundred percent tax bracket for years, sometimes for generations. Under a Negative Income Tax system, they would be entitled to keep at least one-half of their additional earnings, thus, in effect, placing them in a fifty percent tax bracket. This, it would seem to me, would effectively establish a link between income and work.

The successful functioning of the capitalistic system already has tended to reduce the income-work link. This has been accomplished through capital accumulation by one generation and subsequent capital transfer to an ensuing generation. Let me illustrate. I have four sons. They have never done a lick of work in their lives. This is understandable, for they range in age from eighteen months to seven years. Yet, this

year, thanks to stock gifts from generous grandparents, these four youngsters will receive sufficient income to necessitate their paying an income tax.

Professor Michael D. Reagan cites one other piece of evidence in refutation to the "welfare as a way of life" argument. According to Professor Reagan: "General relief roles correlate with the state of the economy. In other words, as more jobs become available, people get themselves off relief. These rolls, which peaked at 525,000 in the 1961 recession, are now below 300,000. The American wants to earn an income when he can, I conclude, and we overrate the necessity of starvation as to a goad to work".

Second, some individuals worry about the possibility of equalizing everyone's income through the device of a Negative Income Tax. This already is possible under present federal statutes. If the Congress wished, it could raise the higher income tax brackets to one hundred percent. Yet this has not happened. Americans want to get ahead. They do not want tax rates so high as to stifle individual incentive. They want their children to get ahead.

For all of the talk about "soak the rich," the dramatic increase in income tax rates occurred during World War II, not in the Depression. The Negative Income Tax, therefore, is no more dangerous than the graduated federal income tax which has been in effect since 1913.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In closing, let me re-emphasize one basic aspect of the Negative Income Tax. Some say it would be revolutionary. Actually, it is gradualistic. Implementation by the federal government can be gradual, starting with a low minimum income level and a high tax rate. Then, year by year, the minimum income level and tax rate could be adjusted in response to the results produced.

Concurrently, the response of the poor will be gradual—a step by step process of self-advancement. This, it seems to me, is a sound and sensible way to attack one of the nation's most serious problems.

AN 18TH DISTRICT POLL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the results of a congressional questionnaire of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report today that we have had an excellent response to our questionnaire circulated throughout the 18th Congressional District of Illinois.

We have tabulated the first 20,000 returns and it shows that the people in my district are taking a realistic look at the war, the National Government and the problems close to home. The poll indicates that people are tired of big spending, big government, and Big Brother in Washington.

They want the war won; taxes cut, not raised; and Federal spending trimmed to a sensible level.

I have asked unanimous consent that the summary of our questionnaire be printed in the RECORD at this point:

SUMMARY OF 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE, 1967

1. Do you approve of the Administration's handling of the Viet Nam war?

	Percent
Yes (6,330).....	31.5
No (12,260).....	61.5
No answer (1,410).....	7.0

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the Viet Nam war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Viet Nam)?

	Percent
Yes (12,000).....	60.0
No (6,100).....	30.5
No answer (1,900).....	9.5

3. Do you favor a 6% surtax on your income tax as proposed by President Johnson to provide an additional \$5 billion for the war effort?

	Percent
Yes (2,030).....	10.0
No (17,220).....	86.0
No answer (760).....	4.0

4. Would you rather cut back domestic spending \$5 billion regardless of how popular or worthwhile the programs?

	Percent
Yes (14,000).....	70.0
No (4,580).....	23.0
No answer (1,420).....	7.0

5. Do you favor a 20% average increase in Social Security benefits with an accompanying increase in payroll taxes?

	Percent
Yes (5,310).....	26.5
No (13,790).....	69.0
No answer (900).....	4.5

6. Should Medicare benefits be extended to disabled persons under 65?

	Percent
Yes (8,680).....	43.5
No (10,000).....	50.0
No answer (1,320).....	6.5

7. Do you favor bussing children to achieve racial balance in our schools?

	Percent
Yes (1,450).....	7.0
No (17,730).....	89.0
No answer (820).....	4.0

8. Do you favor a Federal Open Housing law which also guarantees the individual the right to dispose of his property as he sees fit?

	Percent
Yes (15,540).....	78.0
No (3,430).....	17.0
No answer (1,030).....	5.0

9. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist Bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

	Percent
Yes (6,950).....	35.0
No (11,780).....	59.0
No answer (1,270).....	6.0

10. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotment and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

	Percent
Yes (4,520).....	22.5
No (13,380).....	67.0
No answer (2,100).....	10.5

11. Do you favor reducing the voting age to 18?

	Percent
Yes (6,700).....	33.5
No (12,590).....	63.0
No answer (710).....	3.5

12. Who is your choice for President in 1968?

	Percent
Nixon (4,960).....	24.8
Romney (2,070).....	10.3
Percy (1,210).....	6.1
Johnson (940).....	4.7
Reagan (830).....	4.2
Robert Kennedy (490).....	2.5

	Percent
Not Robert Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson (420).....	2.1
Any Republican (420).....	2.1
Goldwater (419).....	2.1
Wallace (244).....	1.2
Rockefeller (198).....	1.0
Michel (192).....	.9
Any Democrat (163).....	.8
Hatfield (118).....	.6
Lodge (106).....	.5
Dirksen (90).....	.4
Scranton (42).....	.2
Ted Kennedy (42).....	.2
Humphrey (34).....	.2
McNamara (32).....	.1
Kerner (18).....	.1
Morton (12).....	.1
Ford (10).....	.1
Others (602).....	3.0
Undecided (6,350).....	31.7

1. Do you approve of the Administration's handling of the Vietnam war?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	31.5	61.5	7
Hourly employee.....	32.0	63.0	5
Salaried employee.....	38.0	57.0	5
Businessman.....	33.0	64.0	3
Professional.....	37.0	57.0	6
Farmer.....	17.0	74.0	9
Housewife.....	29.0	61.0	10
Retired.....	23.0	67.0	10
Other.....	30.0	53.0	17

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the Viet Nam war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Viet Nam)?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	60	30.5	9.5
Hourly employee.....	55	39.0	6.0
Salaried employee.....	66	29.0	5.0
Businessman.....	61	33.0	6.0
Professional.....	64	31.0	5.0
Farmer.....	59	26.0	15.0
Housewife.....	59	29.0	12.0
Retired.....	55	23.0	22.0
Other.....	50	31.0	19.0

3. Do you favor a 6% surtax on your income tax as proposed by President Johnson to provide an additional \$5 billion for the war effort?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	10	86	4
Hourly employee.....	9	89	2
Salaried employee.....	9	90	1
Businessman.....	12	84	4
Professional.....	11	85	4
Farmer.....	10	85	5
Housewife.....	10	85	5
Retired.....	12	79	9
Other.....	11	82	7

4. Would you rather cut back domestic spending \$5 billion regardless of how popular or worthwhile the programs?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	70	23	7
Hourly employee.....	66	29	5
Salaried employee.....	73	21	6
Businessman.....	74	18	8
Professional.....	68	25	7
Farmer.....	76	18	6
Housewife.....	68	21	11
Retired.....	72	17	11
Other.....	59	32	9

5. Do you favor a 20% average increase in Social Security benefits with an accompanying increase in payroll taxes?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	26.5	69	4.5
Hourly employee.....	29.0	67	4.0
Salaried employee.....	23.0	75	2.0
Businessman.....	22.0	76	2.0
Professional.....	24.0	69	7.0
Farmer.....	11.0	84	5.0
Housewife.....	24.0	68	8.0
Retired.....	51.0	42	7.0
Other.....	39.0	56	5.0

6. Should Medicare benefits be extended to disabled persons under 65?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	43.5	50	6.5
Hourly employee.....	51.0	45	4.0
Salaried employee.....	42.0	53	5.0
Businessman.....	42.0	52	6.0
Professional.....	36.0	56	8.0
Farmer.....	38.0	54	8.0
Housewife.....	36.0	52	12.0
Retired.....	54.0	38	8.0
Other.....	53.0	41	6.0

7. Do you favor bussing children to achieve racial balance in our schools?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	7	89	4
Hourly employee.....	6	91	3
Salaried employee.....	5	93	2
Businessman.....	7	88	5
Professional.....	10	87	3
Farmer.....	8	86	6
Housewife.....	7	89	4
Retired.....	7	85	8
Other.....	11	81	8

8. Do you favor a Federal Open Housing law which also guarantees the individual the right to dispose of his property as he sees fit?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	78	17	5
Hourly employee.....	80	16	4
Salaried employee.....	80	17	3
Businessman.....	71	23	6
Professional.....	77	17	6
Farmer.....	77	16	7
Housewife.....	78	15	7
Retired.....	76	17	7
Other.....	76	17	7

9. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist Bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	35	59	6
Hourly employee.....	31	64	5
Salaried employee.....	44	52	4
Businessman.....	37	55	8
Professional.....	43	53	4
Farmer.....	29	61	10
Housewife.....	22	72	6
Retired.....	20	69	11
Other.....	35	56	9

10. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotment and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	22.5	67	10.5
Hourly employee.....	26.0	64	10.0
Salaried employee.....	23.0	68	9.0
Businessman.....	19.0	70	11.0
Professional.....	22.0	68	10.0
Farmer.....	28.0	67	5.0
Housewife.....	23.0	62	15.0
Retired.....	13.0	75	12.0
Other.....	23.0	61	16.0

11. Do you favor reducing the voting age to 18?

[In percent]			
Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total.....	33.5	63	3.5
Hourly employee.....	38.0	59	3.0
Salaried employee.....	32.0	66	2.0
Businessman.....	32.0	64	4.0
Professional.....	32.0	65	3.0
Farmer.....	31.0	64	5.0
Housewife.....	34.0	59	7.0
Retired.....	32.0	64	4.0
Other.....	38.0	58	4.0

1966 AND 1967 POLL RESULTS COMPARED

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Viet Nam)?

[In percent]			
	1966	1967	
Yes.....	57	60.0	
No.....	36	30.5	
No answer.....	7	9.5	

9. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

[In percent]			
	1966	1967	
Yes.....	28	35	
No.....	67	59	
No answer.....	5	6	

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES A. ROE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise today to pay my respects to the memory of one of our distinguished former Members who served on the House Committee on Military Affairs, the Honorable James A. Roe, of Flushing, Queens County, N.Y., who died April 22.

Jim was a man of many talents: a top athlete, who played semi-professional baseball, a successful businessman, an active and astute political leader, and a distinguished soldier in both World War I and World War II. In World War I he was an outstanding pilot with the Army Signal Corps, and volunteered in World War II to serve with the Army Corps of Engineers, rising to the rank of colonel. Because of his experience in our two World Wars, Jim was in a position to share liberally his deep knowledge of military problems with his colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee, where he served with distinction. However, he was probably better known as chairman of the Democratic Party of Queens County, a position to which he

so successfully devoted his unparalleled leadership talents for 17 years.

He was a leading and influential citizen, not only in his native town of Flushing, but also in Queens County and the State of New York. He led the Democratic Party with foresight and distinction, and was sometimes referred to as a political leader of the old school. Everyone who knew him was greatly impressed by his deep sense of honesty. He was a true friend.

And Jim Roe had thousands of friends. I am sure a number of my colleagues from New York can recall the famous Roe Clambakes, where he was host annually to several thousands of people at the local Queens County racetracks and later at his gracious Westmoreland Farms estate on Shelter Island.

Jim always fought hard to win, but he always fought fairly. While watching him play baseball on one occasion, I was amazed to see a man of his years race hard from his position at shortstop to field a flyball some distance out in left field. He then turned to upbraid his younger teammate in left field who had not thought it worth the effort to chase the ball.

Although eminently successful in politics, it always remained an avocation with him, as he concentrated the major portion of his immeasurable talents to his varied business interests of insurance, banking, and real estate. He developed Flushing farmland into some of the earliest luxury apartment houses in that area, and helped to develop the Murray Hill section of fine homes.

We who knew him have lost a friend. The Nation has lost a true patriot and a noble citizen. He served well his God, his family, his Nation, and his community. What greater epitaph can a man have?

I join his multitude of friends in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family, his wife Margaret, his daughters, Sister Margaret James of the Maryknoll Order, and Mrs. Elmer A. Kestler, his sons, the Honorable James A. Roe, Jr., judge of the New York State Supreme Court, and John, president of the family insurance business, and his beloved grandchildren.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn of the death of our former colleague and my dear friend, Jim Roe.

During his period of service in the House of Representatives, he represented the people of his district in an able and courageous manner—dedicated in his service not only to the people of his district but to the people of the country. His outlook in his service was fine, refreshing, courageous, and progressive.

While his service here was brief, nevertheless he did crowd in a number of contributions that helped to make America a healthier and a better Nation.

His family—his two daughters and

his two sons and his dear wife—set an example for all others to follow in our country.

I join with my friend from New York [Mr. DELANEY] and the other Members of the New York delegation in extending to Mrs. Roe and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Queens, N.Y., and for myself, I would like to join in this tribute to the memory of our favorite son, Jim Roe.

Jim Roe's political career spanned three decades. During some of this country's most hectic and trying times, he served his people well as an advocate of stable but progressive government. An idealist at heart, he nevertheless geared his efforts toward solving the tough problems which accompanied the depression and three wars during the last 30 years.

Mr. Roe began as a Queens County district leader and State committeeman in the 1930's. Within 4 years, he was recognized as one of the most influential figures in New York State. In 1944 he ran successfully for a seat in this House. He declined renomination to the same seat after one term in order to return to local politics in New York, his real love.

Public service to Jim Roe was an avocation. Like many other great Americans Mr. Roe was a successful businessman who spent much of his adult life serving his Nation, State, and local community at a considerable financial sacrifice. But public service to the people of Flushing, N.Y., is a strong tradition of the Roe family. Jim's father was clerk of the Old Flushing Court. His grandfather served in Flushing's own infantry unit during the Civil War. Today, that tradition is being carried on by James A. Roe, Jr., a Queens Supreme Court Justice.

Jim Roe enlisted in the U.S. Army during both the First and Second World Wars. In 1917 he became proficient at the new art of military flying and went on to be one of the early instructors in the Army Air Corps. During World War II he served as a lieutenant colonel in the Army Corps of Engineers and renegotiated nearly a half-billion dollars of war contracts for the U.S. Government.

Just last year, at the age of 70, Jim Roe wrote: "It's about time I retired so younger people can take over." It is my hope that those who follow will carry on his great work. The memory of James A. Roe will live in the hearts of the people of Queens, for he was their mentor.

Mrs. Addabbo joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Margaret, and their children. Our fervent prayer is that their sorrow will be enlightened in the knowledge that their loss is shared by Jim's many friends and associates.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I would

like to associate myself with the eloquent tribute paid to our distinguished former New Yorker, the Honorable James A. Roe, who served with distinction as a Member of this body.

I had the great privilege of knowing Mr. Roe in many ways. As a New Yorker, I knew him as one of the greatest political figures that ever developed in the Democratic Party in our great city. He made magnificent contributions to that party in terms of raising standards for those who sought public office. He sent to the courts, to this body, and the legislature many fine public servants through well-organized and directed campaigns in the great County of Queens.

Jim Roe was man of many, many talents. He was successful in business. He was a giant in terms of his generous contributions to the community. I know that among others he was a steadfast supporter of charities for children. The boys of St. Vincent's Home will miss him terribly because he was one of their finest friends, always giving help in their care and custody.

I also knew Mr. Roe as a neighbor because we summered together in that place that he loved so well at Shelter Island, N.Y. There he maintained a family farm for the enjoyment of his children and the grandchildren of the family and all of those who lived in that beautiful community.

Here was exhibited the quality for which I think Jim Roe will be remembered best, and that is, he was a kind, generous, and loving father and friend to children. Once a year, on the anniversary of the birth of his wife, he had a custom to open the doors of his farm and the fields of his farm—a magnificent place—to all of the children of that community. No matter where they came from or who they were, they were welcomed to the doors of Westmoreland Farm, and at Westmoreland Farm Mr. Roe ran all sorts of recreation and enjoyable pastimes for those children on that day. I can well recall that one of the things the children liked best about him was that he understood what they loved and wanted most. He provided pony and hay rides, a carousel, and every conceivable kind of game and contest.

It was his custom to hire a Good Humor truck, an ice cream truck, and on that day any child coming to the farm would have his choice of any flavor of ice cream he desired. Jim Roe demonstrated he knew how to make children happy and that was his great happiness.

In many ways Mr. Roe was a model and an example to anyone who would serve our country and our community. His service in the World War, so well described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], was one example of his patriotic fervor and devotion to this country. He engaged very strongly in the campaign to elect John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our President. In this he was among the foremost to recognize the great qualities and talents of the young Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Roe supported many fine activities in the community and in his church. With the gentleman from New York

[Mr. DELANEY], I had the privilege and honor of attending the funeral services for our late beloved colleague. In that church many of the men who walk the paths of distinction in New York City were in evidence paying tribute to a fallen leader. But most memorable to me was the fact that in that beautiful church during those last services, emblazoned above the altar, was a single Latin word inscribed—the word "charity." Here was a man of charity in all of the blessedness and significance of that term being laid to rest.

To his dear widow Margaret, to his sons James and John, and his daughter Frances I extend my deepest sympathy. Finally, to his daughter in religion, Sister Margaret James of the Maryknoll Sisters I ask that we be allowed to join in her prayers. As the father of a missionary sister, James A. Roe was most devoted to the cause of the mission of the poor of the world. I know that their prayers will be for him, in eternity, for the rest and rewards he has so well earned in his life of goodness.

He was a man of charity toward all men, charity toward children, and charity toward all of the pursuits of life in which he engaged. We have lost a great and noble figure in the passing of James Roe. He was a giant who never lost the common touch, and our country mourns this loss deeply at this time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add my word of tribute to the late Honorable James A. Roe, Sr., who for most of his life was one of the most outstanding citizens, and an effective civic and political leader in my home county of Queens, New York.

Jim Roe was, above all, a gentleman of his word. He was a notable example of integrity in political leadership, a credit to his party, to Queens, and to the democratic system of government, in the true sense of the word.

These Halls knew Jim Roe as a man who established a highly creditable record as a Congressman, serving Queens and the State of New York with great distinction.

He always had the affairs and the needs of his native Borough of Queens at heart, and he fought relentlessly and successfully for many good causes in behalf of Queens progress, and national welfare. He was a capable, thoughtful public servant and an outstanding political leader.

I am privileged to join my colleagues from Queens and others in this House today in paying my respects to this noteworthy citizen who has passed on, and to express my warm, personal sympathy to his fine family.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to the late James A. Roe, Sr., one of the outstanding citizens of Queens County, N.Y., and a former Member of this body.

Jim Roe was a native of Flushing, Long Island, N.Y., and spent over seven decades of his life serving the county and its residents in various capacities.

For over 30 years he was most active in the political arena, and rose to prom-

inence as the leader of the Democratic Party in Queens County—one of the most powerful and influential political figures in New York City's history. He also saw service in the U.S. Army in two World Wars, enlisting in 1917 as a private in the fledgling Army Air Corps. He was promoted to the rank of lieutenant and instructor in advanced flying and was honorably discharged from the service in 1919. While on active duty in World War II he was elected as a Member of Congress, serving in the House of Representatives for a period of 2 years, from January 1945 until January 1947. He was not a candidate for reelection, but returned to his political and business interests in Queens at the completion of his one term in Congress.

He contributed much to the growth and development of the Democratic Party in Queens County; and he will be remembered with admiration by his many friends and associates.

My deepest sympathies go out to his wife, and his children.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great many of us were saddened to learn of the recent passing of the Honorable James A. Roe, Sr., a former Member of this body, a distinguished colleague and a true friend. I was privileged as were many others here to serve with Jim Roe in the 79th Congress. He was a close friend and I will miss him greatly. A fighter, a man of principle, a dedicated man, Jim was a leader all his life. He served his country as an officer in both World Wars I and II. Raised in a family where public service was a tradition, he more than ably carried on that tradition. It is still being carried on today by his son, the Honorable James A. Roe, Jr., a justice of the New York State Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, New York will not be the same without Jim Roe; he will be sadly missed by all who knew and loved him. To his lovely wife Margaret and his four children I extend my deepest sympathy and my prayers.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a former Representative of the House of Representatives, James A. Roe, Sr., has passed on. I wish to join my colleagues in expressing sorrow to his widow and to his children. I know they have suffered a great loss. I want all to know that not only his family but his friends have suffered a great loss.

James A. Roe, Sr., was a true American. He was a loyal Democrat and for many years a leader of the Democratic Party in New York State. He served his Nation well both in war and peace. The philosophy for which he fought can be expressed in the motto of the United States, "In God We Trust." He practiced this philosophy by expressing his love for his God and his country, and his faith in his fellow man.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late James Roe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN REPORTS ON FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous materials and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep concern over the flow of supplies to the enemies of South Vietnam, I have been for many months seeking to spotlight the trade carried on by free-world-flag ships with North Vietnam. Today I wish to take this occasion to again report to my colleagues and to the American people on the status of this traffic, and to call attention to other facets of the problem of shipping to North Vietnam.

While I am pleased to report that the volume of free world shipping into North Vietnam in the first quarter of 1967 is substantially less than during the first quarter of 1966, it has, in fact, increased over both the third and fourth quarters of 1966. The figures for the first quarter of 1967 indicate that a total of 14 free-world-ship visits to North Vietnamese ports occurred during January, February, and March 1967. The breakdown by month follows:

Free world ships arriving North Vietnam, 1st quarter 1967

Month	British	Maltese	Cypriot	Total
January.....	6	0	0	6
February.....	3	1	1	5
March.....	3	0	0	3
Total.....	12	1	1	14

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly been told by our State Department that these ships are not carrying "strategic cargo." At the same time I have been advised by a most reliable authority that we do not really know everything that these ships are carrying. We do know, however, that of these 14 ships that have called in North Vietnam this year, three carried cargoes that are so highly classified that it cannot be discussed publicly. We can only assume that all of these cargoes are urgently needed by Hanoi. It is useless to pretend that these ships are not helping the enemy when we know that they have the ability to carry an average of 7,600 deadweight tons of unknown cargo every trip. These 14 trips this past January, February, and March could have delivered more than 100,000 tons of cargo to bolster the economy and the war effort of North Vietnam. I say any cargo carried by ships flying free world flags is too much, and

that this traffic must not be allowed to continue.

As you can see Mr. Speaker, these figures belie the statements that free-world shipping to North Vietnam is not significant. Nor can it be stated in defense of those vessels flying the British flag that they are simply "Communist shipowners from Hong Kong over whom the British have no control," as I have been told. Mr. Speaker, the British Government has used its warships to prevent trade with the Government of Rhodesia, but it claims an inability to stop these British-flag ships from trading with North Vietnamese. Just what would happen if ships from Hong Kong were to carry cargo to Mozambique for transshipment to Rhodesia? Last year the British stationed a warship off the African coast to prevent just that sort of traffic—yet they say they are unable to do anything at all to stop this trading with an enemy who has committed his entire resources in a major war.

A related point should also be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this trade to Vietnam. As I have pointed out in detail before, a very substantial amount of cargo is being carried to North Vietnam in Polish ships. At the very time that the Polish Government is making this tremendous effort to support North Vietnamese aggression, the U.S. Government announced that it has relieved the Polish Government from the necessity of repaying \$17,000,000 coming due this year under Public Law 480 food agreements. What this means is that the United States is picking up the tab on the Public Law 480 food and freeing other Polish assets for use in aiding the North Vietnamese. This is nothing but indirect aid to the Communist war effort. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has expressed a desire that some of this \$17,000,000 be used to help teach the Poles English. I suggest that we insist upon this payment in dollars and teach a more practical lesson. How can we ask the American taxpayer to help subsidize the Communist war effort in North Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, the greatest naval force in the world—the U.S. 7th Fleet—is on station in the South China Sea at this time, striking at only those North Vietnamese targets that are not on the restricted list and collecting statistics on the volume of shipping going into the North Vietnamese ports. We have committed over half a million of our finest young men and more than \$2 billion per month to waging this war in Vietnam, but we keep finding excuses for not cutting off the enemy's supplies. We must find some means to stop this flow of materiel that is being used to kill our fighting men. Is it unreasonable to ask that our allies stop helping to supply the enemy? Is it unreasonable to stop giving aid to friends of North Vietnam who are helping them in their war of aggression?

Mr. Speaker, our troops in Vietnam have a right to expect more than our unquestioning acceptance of this aid to the enemy. When in all our history have we tolerated friends that do business with our enemy, and at the same time ask us to support them elsewhere?

Mr. Speaker, if we are ever going to end this war in Vietnam we must do more than we have been doing; I suggest again that the surest way to stop this war is to stop the flow of materiel to the enemy; and the most effective way to stop the seaborne trade with North Vietnam, in my judgment, is to mine the entrances to the North Vietnamese ports. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for us to act decisively, and cut off the fuel to the war machine in Hanoi.

Mr. Speaker at this point in the RECORD I insert the most recent so-called blacklist prepared by the Maritime Administration of the free world and Polish-flag ships that have visited North Vietnamese ports since January 25, 1966, and are therefore prohibited from carrying any U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States:

LIST OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

Section 1. The President has approved a policy of denying United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States to foreign flag vessels which call at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966.

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate United States Government Departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through April 27, 1967. This list does not include vessels under the registration of countries, including the Soviet Union and Communist China, which normally do not have vessels calling at United States ports.

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP:

	Gross tonnage
Total, all flags, 40 ships.....	278,883
British (11 ships)	61,311
<i>Ardgroom</i> (broken up)	7,051
<i>Ardrowan</i>	7,300
<i>Ardara</i> (now <i>Hyperion</i> , British)	5,795
<i>Dartford</i>	2,739
<i>Greenford</i>	2,964
<i>Hyperion</i> (trip to North Vietnam under ex- name, <i>Ardara</i> , Brit- ish)	
<i>Isabel Erica</i>	7,105
<i>Milford</i>	1,889
<i>Santa Granda</i>	7,229
<i>Shienfoen</i>	7,127
<i>Shirley Christine</i>	6,724
<i>Yungfutary</i>	5,388
Cypriot (4 ships)	28,852
<i>Acme</i>	7,173
<i>Agenor</i> (trips to North Vietnam, Greek)	
<i>Alkon</i> (trips to North Vietnam, Greek, broken up)	
<i>Amfitriti</i>	7,147
<i>Amon</i>	7,229
<i>Antonia II</i>	7,303
Greek (2 ships)	14,289
<i>Agenor</i> (now Cypriot)	7,139
<i>Alkon</i> (now Cypriot, broken up)	7,150
Maltese (1 ship)	7,304
<i>Amalia</i>	7,304

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP—continued

	Gross tonnage
Polish (22 ships)	167,127
<i>Andrzej Strug</i>	6,919
<i>Beniowski</i>	10,443
<i>Djakarta</i>	6,915
<i>Energetyk</i>	10,876
<i>General Sikorski</i>	6,785
<i>Hanka Sawicka</i>	6,944
<i>Hanoi</i>	6,914
<i>Hugo Kollataj</i>	3,755
<i>Jan Matejko</i>	6,748
<i>Jozef Conrad</i>	8,730
<i>Kapitan Kosko</i>	6,629
<i>Kochanowski</i>	8,231
<i>Konopnicka</i>	9,690
<i>Lelewele</i>	7,817
<i>Marceli Nowotko</i>	6,660
<i>Marian Bucek</i>	7,053
<i>Norwid</i>	5,512
<i>Phenian</i>	6,923
<i>Stefan Okrzeja</i>	6,620
<i>Transportowiec</i>	10,854
<i>Wieniawski</i>	9,190
<i>Wladyslaw Broniewski</i>	6,919

JOHN BARRY: FATHER OF THE U.S. NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that a nation which has commemorated everything from trees to doughnuts by the proclamation of special days and special weeks, has so far failed to recognize the life and service of the Father of the U.S. Navy.

It is more than strange; it is distressing.

John Barry, an Irish immigrant, went to sea as a youth, and worked his way up to being a well-to-do shipowner in Philadelphia. He became an enthusiastic supporter of the Colonies' fight for independence in the decade before the outbreak of the American Revolution.

When the fighting started, he offered his services to the Continental Congress, and was placed in command of the brig *Lexington*. Under his command, the *Lexington* achieved the first capture of a British warship by any colonial vessel, when it took the British tender *Edward*, on April 17, 1776.

From then on he assumed command of a succession of American men-of-war. The results of his exploits against the British were so outstanding, that he earned General Washington's personal commendation.

As commander of the *Alliance*, a 32-gun man-of-war, he won many valuable prizes. In 1781, he attacked two British vessels, the *Atlanta* and the *Trespassy*, and captured them after a hard battle. He was severely wounded in that battle.

When six frigates were sent to put down the Algerian pirates preying upon vessels of the United States in 1794, Barry was in command of one of the ships.

In 1798, he was named commander of all American naval forces in the West Indies. At the time of his death in 1803, he was the commander of the entire Navy.

Contemporary experts, and historians

in later years, have placed him as one of the greatest of all naval commanders of his day, and have given him credit for establishing the great Navy of which Americans have always been justly proud.

The people of the United States owe a great deal to this Irish immigrant boy who became one of this Nation's great heroes.

For that reason, I have today introduced a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue an annual proclamation designating September 13 each year—the date of the birth of the Father of the American Navy—as Commodore John Barry Day.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AGRIBUSINESS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a meeting which is to be held in Chicago May 10-12 under the auspices of the Chicago Board of Trade, the world's largest commodity exchange.

This meeting is the First International Agribusiness Conference and distinguished leaders in Government and industry, including Vice President HUMPHREY, will be among the speakers and others well known and distinguished will be in attendance. For example, the meeting will be opened by Governor Kerner. Among the speakers on the first day are the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, Eugene V. Rostow, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and Herbert V. Prochnow, president of the First National Bank of Chicago.

To give you an idea of the scope of the conference, let me read its "purpose":

To direct the attention of agribusiness and industry to the rapidly developing problem of world hunger.

To demonstrate the need and opportunities for employment of private American capital, business methods, and technology.

To find ways to overcome the obstacles involved; to develop new approaches to business and government cooperation.

To obtain the dynamic involvement of American agribusiness in this, one of the greatest challenges to be faced in the balance of this century.

As Members of the House know, one of the world's foremost problems is the lack of food, particularly in the underdeveloped countries of the world. There are approximately 3.4 billion people in the world and almost half of these suffer from undernourishment, or malnutrition, or both. Almost 12,000 persons die every day of hunger or diseases arising from hunger. Moreover, the situation is worsening steadily because the population growth is outrunning the increase in food production.

The Chicago Board of Trade has been a pioneer in urging that the efficiency and productivity of American agriculture be utilized in helping to meet the challenge of the food crisis. In Denver, Colo., in 1964, the then president of the board, Robert C. Liebenow, outlined a proposed program to deal with the sit-

uation which paralleled in many ways the Food for Peace Act passed late in 1966 and which undertook systematically to deal with both the problem of immediate needs on the part of the underdeveloped nations and that of helping the poorer countries modernize their agricultural systems. So great is the need for food that we cannot supply the deficit but must use our productivity to avert famine until countries like India can feed themselves.

The board furnishes an example of enlightened leadership in going far beyond the scope of its own immediate interests to deal with matters of the highest public importance. Mr. Liebenow is no longer president of the board but now heads the Corn Refiners Association, Inc., of Washington, D.C. But the board has carried on the program which he helped formulate under the leadership of Robert L. Martin, chairman of the board, and Warren W. Lebeck, executive vice president, and have broadened its scope.

Recently, a distinguished North Carolinian, Henry Hall Wilson, a member of President Johnson's White House staff, became president of the board. He is an extremely able man and is well known to many Members of the Congress. He has had a distinguished career both in his native State and in Washington. Under his leadership, the Chicago Board of Trade will continue to show the vision and concern with the public good which has made it an asset to Chicago, the Midwest, and the country as a whole.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Board of Trade is performing a public service in bringing together leaders in Government and industry for a conference on the world food problems on May 10-12.

For a number of years the Chicago Board of Trade has interested itself in basic farm problems.

Obviously, the board wants a free market for farm products but it has recognized the existence of Federal farm programs and the reasons for their existence. It has recognized also, what many agribusiness do not take into account, the necessity of a fair return to the farmer for his labor and planning. One of the most unusual speeches made by an agribusiness leader in recent years was an address by the then president of the board, Robert C. Liebenow, at Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind., on October 31, 1960. The title was "The Farmer Needs a Good Press Agent." Mr. Liebenow said, in effect, that the public did not understand the tremendous value of an efficient and productive agricultural system, the best the world had ever seen and that such an understanding was a requisite for sound farm policies.

In 1962, the board of trade held a national agricultural policy forum at which farm policy was discussed by the country's leading agricultural economists.

Over the years the board has undertaken many other projects in the interests of agriculture as a whole. Now it is sponsoring an agribusiness conference to explain the contribution which the agribusiness industries can make to food-for-freedom programs.

The board is to be commended and, in commending the board, we are praising its board of directors and others who help shape policy, including officials of the board.

Robert C. Liebenow was president of the board from 1956 until 1965. He was from an agriculture State, South Dakota, and he knew farm problems at firsthand. He is now head of the Corn Refiners Association, Inc., and his interest in farm problems continues.

Clarence Rowland, son of a former manager of the Chicago White Sox, was chairman of the board in 1960 when many of the policies now in operation were formulated.

James P. Reichmann was chairman of the board in 1961 and 1962 and Bernard P. Carey in 1963, 1964, and 1965. Both were business and community leaders, as was Robert L. Martin, who became chairman in 1966. He had been in the grain business since 1934 and he extended the scope of the board public affairs programs. He was assisted by Warren W. Lebeck, who became executive vice president of the board in 1965, after being its Secretary for a number of years. Mr. Lebeck was at one time an assistant to Sewell Avery, former industrialist who headed Montgomery Ward. Irwin Johnson is a vice president in charge of the board's educational and informational programs and he also is a veteran in the board's service.

The board has done some remarkable things over the past 7 or 8 years. One can only conclude that it has done them because it has had remarkable leadership.

THE QUIE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time between April 20 and today, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has been subjected to the full force of the "Johnson juggernaut," the 1968 version of the famed Johnson "arm twisting" as practiced when the President was majority leader in the other body.

To come under the full blast of the modern Johnson juggernaut is an unsettling experience, to say the least. It all started when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] announced the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 8983. It would consolidate four categorical aid programs for elementary and secondary schools into one single grant with each State developing a plan to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to meet the crying education needs of each State. This would immeasurably improve Federal educational aid.

The present plan for distributing funds is frustrating to school administrators, wastes funds and denies States and

local schools the opportunity to plan creatively to improve education.

The Quie amendment would correct this.

The tremendous campaign of half truths and deliberate misinformation which has been mounted by the administration against the Republican-supported measure is almost unprecedented in its intensity.

The chief misrepresentation is the statement made by the Johnson juggernaut time and time again that the Republicans have set out deliberately to cut off benefits to pupils in private and parochial schools. Mr. QUIE has tried again and again to scotch this outright untruth. He has issued news releases, statements to his colleagues in the House and Senate, talked to dozens of newspaper reporters and telephoned many, many school and political leaders.

The administration keeps pounding away at this theme: the Quie amendment will deny Federal benefits to students in parochial and private schools. Mr. QUIE has presented irrefutable evidence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and elsewhere, that his amendment would not discriminate against parochial school pupils. Actually, it would expand the type of services required for private school students in present law.

Yet, the misrepresentation, first launched by U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II, about April 24—as recorded in a story in the Washington Post for April 25, 1967—has been repeated by so many persons, including the President of the United States, that it has gained the simulacrum of truth.

Also planting the seeds of dissension publicly was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner, in a speech he made at a reception in his honor by the American Newspaper Women's Club, as reported in the Washington Post for April 27, 1967:

The Quie substitute, he said, "cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job." Further, it has brought about a return of the "old dissensions and divisiveness" on the Church-State question.

Both statements are false.

While this is the first evidence I have found in the press, I have been told of a flurry of telephone calls which spread the word across the Nation the day after Mr. QUIE announced the amendment—April 20. The intent of the telephone calls was to spread the false rumor that the Quie amendment meant the end of Federal benefits to pupils in private schools.

As a result of the telephone calls, the Congress has been inundated with thousands of letters from men and women who have been purposely misled. One Congressman has received over 5,000 such letters.

Mr. Speaker, I might note at this point that I have received very few of these letters from my area, the 38th District of New York. It is apparent that my constituents know that I would not sponsor a measure that would penalize private school children.

The intensity of the attack continued to mount. On Thursday, April 27, the President himself repeated the private school misrepresentation at Camp

Springs, Md. Thus, the biggest gun in the Johnson juggernaut was unleashed at the Quie amendment.

The United Press International wire story—UPI No. 48—was rather lengthy as wire stories go, running to 50 lines. It was widely used. I insert the entire UPI story at this point to illustrate how the Johnson juggernaut operates:

EDUCATION

CAMP SPRINGS, Md.—President Johnson today accused opponents of his education program now pending in Congress of behaving recklessly for partisan political advantage.

The chief executive made a special helicopter trip to a new vocational training center in this Maryland suburb of Washington to mount a new attack on opponents of his legislation.

The program would extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two years at a cost of about \$6.7 million. The bill has run into trouble in the House, where Republicans are pushing hard for a substitute measure.

The President in his prepared speech accused opponents of his proposals of trying to revive bitterness between church and public school leaders, and between poor and wealthy States.

Speaking of the opposition which he did not identify by name or party, he said, "They are raising the same roadblocks which halted Federal aid to education for 20 long years."

"I hope Members of Congress will stop, look and listen before they march down this blind alley. It is a time of testing for American education."

"The gains we have made so far are only the beginning. We must build on them. But we must not lose all we have gained by this reckless effort to rewrite our laws for partisan political advantage."

The President pointed out that in the past 20 years Congress had successfully developed programs which overcame ancient feuds and wiped out major roadblocks to Federal aid to education, to the general benefit of the country.

Now, however, he said "Some so-called 'friends of education' want to go back where we started."

The administration plan calls for a \$3.5 billion extension of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, with the money going to school districts which in turn can make Government programs available to private school students.

Under the House-Republican substitute, the aid would go to the States in lump sums, to do with as they saw fit.

"They claim they know a better way to spend the money," he added. "They propose to discard the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—to scrap it before it is two years old—and to substitute a different kind of legislation."

"No one can tell for sure how they plan to change the law. Each day they trot out a new version."

Describing opposition tactics, Johnson said:

"They have stirred up the suspicions of the poor States against the wealthy States. They are reviving ancient and bitter feuds between church and public school leaders. They have aroused fears of the big city school superintendents."

The site of the President's speech was the new vocational center at Crossland High School in Camp Springs.

Johnson took the occasion to mark the 50th anniversary of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 which originated Federal support to the States for vocational education.

The President, you will note, repeated the misrepresentation:

They are reviving ancient and bitter feuds between Church and public school leaders.

The fact is, as I have detailed in this message, the "revival of the ancient and bitter feuds" was an act of the administration, in a calculated maneuver to defeat the Quie amendment.

So successful was the administration's skillful deception, that last Friday House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD and Mr. QUIE called a major news conference to present the truth to the American people.

The news conference itself was a success. Over 100 persons attended. Mr. QUIE and his colleagues presented the facts from the Republican point of view. They included, in addition to Mr. QUIE, Congressman WILLIAM H. AYRES, of Ohio, MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan, JOHN ERLBORN, of Illinois, and WILLIAM STEIGER, of Wisconsin.

The questions were penetrating and evidenced a genuine desire by the press to get at the facts.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert the joint statement by Mr. FORD and Mr. QUIE, plus individual statements by Mr. FORD and Mr. QUIE which were distributed at the news conference. I do this with a purpose, because subsequent operations of the Johnson juggernaut almost buried these statements:

ADMINISTRATION HAS MOUNTED AN ATTACK OF INCREDIBLE PROPORTIONS TO SAVE ITS ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT BILL, FIRST MAJOR TEST OF STRENGTH IN 90TH CONGRESS

(Joint statement by Hon. GERALD R. FORD, House minority leader, and Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE, First District, Minnesota, April 28, 1967)

The Administration, in an attack almost unprecedented in its scope and bitterness, has within the past week launched an all-out assault on the Republican amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (H.R. 8983).

Twice the Administration has postponed debate and action on the Administration bill, H.R. 7819. When it will finally be brought up even the Administration will not say. We believe we have the votes to win as of today.

If we win on this vital issue, it could create a pattern for the 90th Congress. That is the reason the Johnson Administration is employing outright misrepresentation against the Republican substitute, known as the Quie amendment.

So widespread has been this attack, so unfair has it been, that we are forced to make this statement to bring the truth to the American people.

Here are the facts on the four major issues raised by the Administration:

1. The President has charged we are behaving recklessly for partisan advantage by opposing the Administration's extensions of the ESEA through the 1968-69 school year.

Answer: It is not the supporters of the Republican amendment who are behaving recklessly for partisan political advantage. It is the Administration. The public must understand that the Administration regards this as the first major test of strength of the 90th Congress. If the Republican alternative should win, as now appears quite possible, the tenor and tone of the entire 90th Congress will change. Other alternatives to Great Society programs may also be enacted. For this reason the Administration has postponed consideration of ESEA. Over the past week, since the Republican amendment was announced, we have been subjected to an

attack of almost incredible proportions. This attack has dealt in misinterpretation and fear to such an extent that it is almost impossible to reply to each distortion.

The Administration has marshaled its largest-bore guns—from the President, who attacked the proposal Thursday, to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, and individual Members of Congress with statements in the Congressional Record. The magnitude of the attack is truly awesome. Again, the reason for the attack is that the Administration feels it must win this first test of strength in the 90th Congress or it will lose the whole ball game in the 90th Congress.

2. The President has accused opponents of his measure of trying to revive bitterness between church and public school leaders.

Answer: This totally untrue accusation is the most serious, the most regrettable and the most unfair. The widely-disseminated rumor that the Republican bloc grant approach would penalize pupils in private (and parochial schools) is an outright deception. The Quie amendment was announced on Thursday (April 20.) The following Sunday, when scarcely a handful of private school officials had even read the Quie amendment, a false report spread across the nation: "This means the end to benefits for private school pupils." Obviously, a few strategically-placed telephone calls from the Administration caused the unjustified reaction. Private school people were, in truth, victimized by Administration officials.

The Quie Amendment from the very beginning contained the same language as the present act respecting participation of private school children in the benefits of the program. The amendment even increased the types of assistance which could be made available.

We have even gone a step farther by writing in clarifying language to make even more explicit the intent that the Federal bloc grants would not be commingled with State funds to be spent for general educational purposes, but would be funds to be spent for special programs. Secondly, the Republican amendment specifically states that private school children would enjoy the same degree of participation in these programs under the Quie amendment as they now do under ESEA.

In truth, it was the subtle, behind-the-scenes maneuvering of the Administration that tended to "revive the bitterness between church and public school leaders." The Administration has deliberately tried to cause confusion and fear in the hearts of private school authorities, for its own political advantage.

3. The President said we have tried to revive bitterness and distrust between the so-called poor and rich states.

Answer: The allegation that the "poor would get poorer and the rich would get richer" is a classic example of Administration misrepresentation. This is absolutely untrue. Beginning with the 1968-69 school year, under the Republican plan, \$3 billion would be available for distribution under a formula used for nine years in the National Defense Education Act which takes into account the ability of each State to support education, and thereby favors poorer States. The main formula in the present Elementary-Secondary Act is so inequitable that it provides a payment of \$129.64 for each poor child counted in Mississippi and \$393.14 for each child counted in New York.

To dispel any fears of reduced allocations, the Quie Amendment would require that a state's allotment could not be less than its total allotments for the year ending June 30, 1968, under Titles I, II, III, and V of ESEA.

The Republican amendment would assure the states of a continuing authorization of \$3 billion in aid, starting with the 1968-69

school year. States would know well in advance what they could expect. On the other hand, if the Administration bill becomes law, states could not know for certain what would be available. It could range as low as \$2.3 billion, based on the actual appropriations under the present act.

4. The President said Thursday, this is "a time of testing for American education."

Answer: We agree that this is a time of testing, but not in the sense the President meant. It is a time of testing because America must choose between the path of more and more Federal control over education and the other path, which will assure the states and local communities their rightful control over education. After all, it was America's local schools that built our educational system into the best in the world. It was not control from Washington which produced this superb educational system. This is the one issue before us in the consideration of the Quie Amendment.

We must all understand that the Federal money goes Federal influence. The Republican amendment seeks to reduce the danger of Federal control. It also seeks to greatly reduce the endless red tape which is strangling local school boards in their dealings with the vast bureaucracy in Washington.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, OF MICHIGAN, HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

President Johnson has made wild and irresponsible charges against the House Republican Leadership and leading advocates of the Republican substitute for the Administration's elementary-secondary school aid bill.

This Administration is playing fast and loose with the truth and has been engaging in such tactics ever since Rep. Quie unveiled his substitute measure on April 20. This further widens the Credibility Gap.

It is the Administration which has revived the church-state issue in connection with elementary-secondary school aid, not House Republicans. Administration officials did this by falsely asserting that aid to private schools would be virtually eliminated under the Quie Amendment. They deliberately fed misinformation about the Quie Amendment to private school officials. The truth is, of course, that the Quie Amendment from the outset has contained assurances that private schools would continue to receive full benefits. These assurances were couched in the same language found in the existing Elementary-Secondary School Aid Act. The truth is on our side.

We have one purpose and one purpose only in seeking adoption of the Republican substitute. That is to cut federal red tape in the channeling of federal aid to elementary and secondary schools and to let state and local educators set priorities. We would do that with bloc sum grants.

The President has falsely asserted that Republicans "trot out a new version" of their school aid substitute each day. The truth is we have made slight additions to the language in our legislation to calm the fears of private school leaders—groundless fears stirred up by the Administration through a scare campaign based on false statements.

The church-state issue actually is not involved in this matter. This is a choice between the Administration's categorical kind of elementary-secondary school aid and the Republican approach of bloc sum grants. The only issue is more local control and less federal influence. The present pattern of benefits for private schools will continue. We are heartily in favor of it.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT H. QUIE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

The President makes charges that my amendment has stirred up suspicions of poorer states against wealthier states and re-

vived the ancient and bitter feud between church and public school leaders.

He reminds me of a pyromaniac who threw a match into gasoline and stood there pumping on the bellows saying "look at those people starting the fire" while he is fanning the flames all the while.

The formula in my bill uses up-to-date census information. The Administration formula uses 1959 income figures. My bill uses the time-tested equalization formula in Federal law such as the National Defense Education Act whereby the poorer states receive more money per child than the wealthier states because of their lower per capita income. To offset the misinformation of the Administration, I will include language in my bill that no state shall receive less money than they did in fiscal 1968.

As any person who can read can tell, my amendment protects private school children better than the Administration bill.

The main issue before us is this: Shall we stop the relentless step by step centralization of education decisions in Washington or trust the knowledge and sensitivity of people on the state and local level to set priorities and the use of Federal money within the guidelines laid down by the present Act.

Mr. Speaker, to further illustrate the power of the Johnson juggernaut, I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story about the news conference which was carried by United Press International—UPI No. 99—on April 28:

EDUCATION

WASHINGTON.—House Republicans and Democrats today swapped charges of "credibility" and "incredibility" gaps in a mounting off-the-floor debate on the administration's education bill.

The exchanges came in separate party news conferences after President Johnson yesterday accused opponents of his education program of reviving bitterness between church and public school leaders.

The \$3.5 billion administration bill would extend through fiscal 1969 authority for the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides teaching aids for poverty area children.

Rep. Albert H. Quie, R-Minn., has introduced a GOP substitute bill to provide that aids under the act be given to States in lump sum grants rather than allot money for individual programs.

Minority Leader Gerald Ford, R-Mich., told a news conference Johnson "made wild and irresponsible charges. This administration is playing fast and loose with the truth. This further widens the credibility gap."

Majority Leader Carl Albert, D-Okla., followed with a Democratic news conference at which Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind., sponsor of the administration bill, accused Republicans of an "incredibility gap."

"It's incredible that the Republicans say their bill would do away with Federal red tape and controls," Brademas said. "Their so-called block grant bill is loaded with categories and requirements."

Albert said the Quie bill "would be disastrous for educational advancement in this country. It's a political bill to round up votes. Its jerry-built legislation at its worst."

Quie said at the GOP news conference that Johnson's attack on his opponents "reminds me of a pyromaniac who threw a match into gasoline and stood there pumping on the bellows saying 'Look at those people starting the fire' while he is fanning the flames all the while."

Mr. Speaker, you will note that of the 30 lines, only 12 deal with the news conference called by Mr. Ford and Mr. Quie, compared with the full 50 which the UPI carried on the President's speech of last Thursday.

My purpose is not to compare coverage of this news conference with an address by the President. I want to call your attention to the technique by which the Johnson juggernaut succeeded in burying the joint answer to the most serious charges made by the President on Thursday.

Here is how the administration operates: The morning of the Ford-Quie news conference, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT called his own news conference in his office, supposedly to answer our news conference. The same morning three other administration supporters either called news conferences or issued news releases, including Congressman CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Congressman JAMES G. O'HARA, of Michigan, and Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana.

As a result, the UPI story and other stories never did get around to dealing with the hard facts presented in the Ford-Quie news conference which demolished the administration representations.

This, indeed, is a classic example of the awesome power of the Johnson juggernaut. It is the old "arm-twisting" technique of the then Senator Johnson when he was majority leader in the U.S. Senate, magnified a hundredfold. Now the President has at his disposal the entire executive branch. He has at his disposal some \$425 million a year allocated to "public information and public relations" by the various Federal departments, first revealed in a story carried by the Associated Press. The nearly half a billion dollars pays the salaries of over 6,800 "public relations" experts, who are naturally expected to justify the expenditures controlled from Washington. In other words, the taxpayers are financing a vast propaganda campaign aimed at taxpayers.

Thus the old "arm-twisting" device, which was extremely effective in the President's Senate days, has a hundred times the power in the fearful form of the sleek, deadly efficient 1967 Johnson juggernaut.

Mr. QUIE knows. He was run over by the juggernaut last week. Fortunately, both the Quie amendment and Mr. QUIE were not laid low permanently by the juggernaut. Over the weekend he picked himself up, along with the battered but unbowed Quie amendment, and he and those who stanchly support him are prepared for yet unknown assaults. My colleagues who support the block grant approach do know this: there will be other attacks, perhaps even more unfair. I understand the minions in the Gardner-Howe HEW empire are even now laboriously compiling Mr. QUIE's voting record on education legislation for the 9 years he has served in the Congress. I should surmise that project alone will consume some hundreds of man-hours at, say, \$10 an hour, all charged to the taxpayer, who innocently supposes that all they do over at HEW is try to improve education.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, "a funny thing happened on the way to the forum" of the U.S. House of Representatives. Everyone expected that the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act bill would have, some days ago, been debated in that forum. It is apparent the administration even now does not have the votes. The supporters of the Quile amendment have another week or so to get the truth out to the Nation. This will be enough time.

There are hopeful signs the truth about the Quile amendment is getting about the country.

I wish to close this necessarily long address by placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel for June 27, 1967, titled "Education Grants":

EDUCATION GRANTS

Judging from the negative reaction of the national school commissioner, there must be something mighty good about the Republican substitute for federal aid to elementary and secondary education proposed by Rep. Quile of Minnesota.

In the morning's mail (postage and fees paid by the United States department of health, education and welfare) is a statement from Commissioner Howe raising "serious questions" and calling the proposal "a backward step."

DOES PLAN WORRY HOWE?

Why stage such a sharp counterattack, particularly by going over the heads of congress to the public, as it were, if one is not worried by the appeal of the substitute? The answer to that question would seem to be that the Quile proposal must have merits that could win it enough support, even in a Democrat controlled congress, to be adopted. What is the Quile proposal? Basically, it would substitute block grants to the states for the present complicated program of allocations to school districts under title I of the elementary and secondary education act of 1965.

The block grant approach would not take effect until July 1, 1968, giving time for the advance planning necessary to any program. For the first year, fiscal 1969, \$3 billion would be authorized, about \$200 million less than the maximum total authorizations of the program it would replace. However, it could prove to be a net gain, for, as Quile points out, "the block grant programs would represent massive savings in administrative costs to the schools. . . ."

"Actually," Quile says, "the distribution of funds within each state would be far more responsive to the most urgent educational needs than under the existing act, which tends to scatter funds into every school district." Remember the fuss last May when affluent Whitefish Bay was found to be entitled to \$25,000 in federal funds intended for disadvantaged children.

Under the amendment proposed by Quile, the state plan for the use of the funds would have to contain "assurances that the highest priority . . . will be given to local educational agencies which are experiencing the greatest educational difficulties because of such factors as: (A) heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, (B) rapid increases in school enrollment which overwhelm the financial resources of a local educational agency, and (C) geographic isolation and economic depression in particular areas."

In other words, in Wisconsin, for example, the federal school aid funds could be concentrated in districts where they are most needed, instead of being spread around according to an unrealistic formula that puts dollars needed in Milwaukee's inner core into an affluent suburb.

The promise of relief from bureaucratic red tape and a more sensible distribution of funds is not the only thing to commend the Republican substitute. Another of its appeals is that it would, as Quile says, "sig-

nificantly reduce the power of the United States commissioner in local school decisions," which may explain Howe's negative reaction.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote from the editorial as the final point in this statement:

Judging from the negative reaction of the national school commissioner, there must be something mighty good about the Republican substitute for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

And again:

Why stage such a sharp counterattack?

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope I have explained why the administration is staging such a sharp counterattack. I also hope my colleagues, armed with this explanation, will resolutely resist the forthcoming "arm twisting" in the Halls of the House, which will probably begin like this: "You know, John—or Tom or Dick or Harry—about that dam—or post office or grant—in your district."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 543

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I voted for House Joint Resolution 543, which extends the no-strike period for an additional 47 days, because I believe neither the railroads, the unions involved, nor the administration are prepared to deal with the situation that would prevail if this resolution were to fail of adoption.

Nevertheless, I cast my vote reluctantly, because this second extension of the no-strike period represents a kind of nibbling away at the right to strike which I do not feel is in the public interest.

There is no doubt that all concerned—industry, labor, and the public—want to avoid a strike which would have serious impact on the Nation's economy and the movement of defense materiel.

An impasse appears to have been reached, and the parties directly concerned seem to be looking for Government action of some kind, but there is no agreement as to the kind of action that should be taken. The administration has yet to recommend any program.

It is my understanding that the administration will within a few days come forward with its proposals. Hopefully, they will be such as to maintain maximum pressure on both sides to arrive at a reasonable settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill but I would not be inclined to support a further extension of the no-strike period unless it is coupled with some acceptable programs designed to provide a rational and honorable long-range solution to this problem.

WE MUST REDUCE THE BURDENS OF OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many senior citizens in our country are being misled as to the proposals offered by the President regarding income taxes imposed on people over the age of 65. For those of low or modest income, these proposals could be a great aid. Only those with larger incomes would have their tax burdens increased.

The President's proposals would, if enacted, relieve about half a million senior citizens, who now pay some income tax, from the necessity of paying any income tax at all. As I understand it, a man and wife, each 65 or older, would pay no taxes unless their social security, plus outside income, were more than \$5,777 a year and a single person, aged 65 or older, would pay no taxes unless his or her annual income were more than \$3,222.

It is true that social security payments would for the first time be included as income in computing taxable income, and that the double exemption now provided for 65-year-olds would be eliminated. However, in their place, would be a far more generous deduction for senior citizens, as the following example demonstrates:

Assume a husband and wife who get \$200 a month in social security payments and who receive \$65 a week in other income—private pensions, business investments, and so forth. They would have a total income of about \$5,777 a year and would pay no taxes under the President's proposal.

In contrast, under existing law, the same couple has to pay income taxes of about \$80. The social security benefits are not taxable income, but the \$3,377 of other income would be. The man and his wife each get two personal exemptions—four times \$600 equals \$2,400. Subtracting the \$2,400 and the minimum standard deduction of \$400—\$300 for the husband and \$100 for the wife—from the \$3,377 in taxable income, there is left a net taxable income of \$577 under existing law, on which the tax is about \$80. This is more than the cost of the senior citizens' contribution for doctors' fees under the medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all of us make certain that the increasing burdens on our senior citizens are reduced—particularly for those who are caught in the squeeze between low, fixed incomes and rising prices. It appears to me that the President's proposed revisions of the income tax law are a step in that direction.

But tax relief is only one of a number of legislative steps which should be taken. We also need substantial increases in social security payments, improvements in medicare, and programs such as my own proposal for an older Americans community service program, which will enable senior citizens to become active in community activities and earn a little something to supplement social security payments. I have long since indicated my support for each of these actions and

I hope that this Congress will respond to this dramatic need in our society.

WOLFF URGES TAX CREDIT FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, while the need for a college education has increased in our technological society to the point of necessity, the expenses incurred in providing such education have grown to be a crippling burden on the American taxpayer. At a time when 1 year of higher education commonly costs in the neighborhood of \$2,000, parents with one or two children in college, or students trying to put themselves through school are suffering severe financial hardships. Yet without this educational preparation our Nation would not have the manpower to maintain its leadership or forge ahead into new areas of progress. It is truly in our national interest to ease the financial hardship incurred by our citizens as they are educated to be future leaders and I urge my colleagues to support the bill I introduce today which would allow a tax credit for these individuals in providing this necessary higher education.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LVI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, another argument against a voluntary armed force is that such a system will result in a shortage of officers. Since most officers have a college background, opponents of abolition claim that with the absence of a draft, the male college student will not volunteer in sufficient numbers to maintain an adequate officer corps.

Such an argument can be answered in several ways. For example, military service, particularly when serving as an officer, does have appeal to even college students and I assume this will continue regardless of whether there is a draft or not. Another way to attract additional college graduates into the officer corps is to offer scholarships to the young men to enable them to obtain a college education in return for a guaranteed number of years of military service. I might add that under our present system 73 percent of those who receive an officer commission by way of ROTC do not elect to remain beyond their original obligation.

Another avenue which can be opened

up to acquire more officers is, of course, to allow for greater accession from the ranks of the enlisted men. Through a stepped-up training program, many of these soldiers would make fine officers.

The facilities of the military academies can also be expanded substantially to take in many more of the young men who desire entrance but have been denied this opportunity due to the limited enrollments at these institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the critics of abolition should first direct their attention to the present draft system for it does not guarantee a sufficient supply of officers. As General Johnson remarked some time ago:

In fiscal year 1965 it is projected that only 2,523 officers will elect to stay on active duty compared to our minimum requirement of 3,615.

This failure to retain an adequate number of trained, experienced officers is a serious handicap to the operational readiness of our military units. A voluntary armed force will give the military the professional it needs by retaining its skilled officer corps, something our present system has failed to do.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT—EQUALLY RESPONSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, there has been, with regard to the railway labor dispute, as indeed there is with regard to all disputes which tend to cause inconvenience to the public or to threaten national interests, a good deal of comment to the effect that labor disputes should not be "permitted" to cause such inconvenience or pose such threats.

This is difficult to argue with, but I do believe it ought to be pointed out, and it very seldom is pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that such inconvenience and such threats are not unilateral actions of the workers involved. Whenever a transportation system or a basic industry experiences, or is threatened with a strike, there is a wide public assumption that the union, or the workers themselves, are being obstinate, that even though collective bargaining is legitimate, the unions and their members have the basic responsibility for deciding whether or not the damage from such a dispute will affect the public.

Mr. Speaker, it seems only fair to point out that this dispute, like almost all such disputes, involves an impasse in which both unions and management are engaged, that the damage or inconvenience which will result from such a dispute is caused at least in equal part by labor and by management—that management in this case is not a helpless bystander, but a force at least as immovable as is labor.

I oppose compulsory arbitration, as I always have, and I do not think it would

be a useful solution in this case. I think the damage that is done to a free society by forcing solutions in labor disputes is almost always more severe than the damage that could be caused by any such dispute itself. But I think we should remember that if management is justified in refusing to meet labor demands, then labor is equally justified in refusing to perform its duties on management's terms.

If one contends, as is so often contended, that working men owe an obligation to society not to strike a basic industry or a basic mode of transportation, then he must concede at the same time that management has an equal obligation to society not to refuse to pay wages and meet demands for working conditions which represent the honest and irreducible demands of the labor force.

If, as I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the railroad operators want to argue that they cannot afford to meet the needs of their employees, that their duty to their stockholders requires them to be adamant, then we must also give a ready ear to labor's point that the workingman cannot afford to work for wages which are significantly lower than the wages paid in other industries for similar work. The free market concepts which permit a company to say "thus far and no further" in the course of wage negotiations also permit a workingman to say "that much and no less," and to refuse to work if he feels he cannot work under the terms management will offer. If we are going to arrive at a position where we decide that some industries are so essential that workers in them have an obligation to work, then we must also recognize that management in those same industries has an obligation to pay for the work performed.

I voted for House Joint Resolution 543 because, like most members of this House, I felt there was no alternative but to extend the cooling-off period. But let no one interpret my vote as showing any sympathy for the concept that railroad employees have relinquished their right to bargain for better wages and working conditions, and the absolutely fundamental right—which is absolutely essential to equal bargaining—to withhold their labor if their just demands are not met.

When this cooling-off period comes to an end, I hope that management will have demonstrated some concern for the public interest to which its friends in the Congress so frequently appeal. If not, I think perhaps the Congress should give some thought to considering legislation, not to cripple railroad labor, but to relieving the railroads' management of their obligation to their stockholders—perhaps by making the railroads publicly owned, nonprofit institutions.

LET US MOVE AHEAD, AS FAST AS POSSIBLE, WITH THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the broad support in this Congress for a continuation of an economic opportunity program for the poor, but I am somewhat concerned over the tactics my friends across the aisle would use to extend such a program.

I have noted the 1967 amendments that have been proposed to the Economic Opportunity Act by the President and introduced in the House by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee; and I have taken a look at the alternative proposal that has been offered by several members of the minority of that committee.

It appears to me that the thrust in each case is the same; each party is prepared to wage war on poverty by making it possible for the poor to qualify for the economic opportunity available to other Americans.

It is obvious, however, that my friends across the aisle would wage their war without a headquarters; they would abandon the command post the Office of Economic Opportunity offers and I am convinced that this would be a grievous strategical error.

The present economic opportunity program can be improved. It is being improved. And the early mistakes that were inevitable in a crash attack on a massive problem are now being avoided.

That improvement must be channeled throughout the program in organized fashion, however. This can only be achieved by the Congress if a central headquarters is maintained.

A dispersing of various phases of the antipoverty program to various bureaus throughout government will serve no one. The poor will lose their voice at the national level of Government. The Congress will have difficulty finding what is going on—and where. And the Nation will lose the benefit that comes with the focus on the problem that a concentrated office provides.

The fight against poverty must go forward but not in a disorganized, rag-tag fashion. It is up to this Congress to build on the experience of the Economic Opportunity Act and to consider thoroughly the amendments that have been suggested by the President.

Our cause is good. The groundwork has been laid for continued progress in bringing the poor together with economic opportunity. This is no time to turn back, as some would suggest.

By moving ahead, as fast as possible, we will serve the poor but we will serve the Nation more.

JUDGE KENNEDY STAYS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is good news to report from the war on poverty in San Francisco. Judge Joseph G. Kennedy, a competent and dedicated public servant, has agreed to continue as chairman of the economic opportunity council. This means that important progress can be made on the base that Judge Kennedy has helped to build.

I fully share the satisfaction of the San Francisco Chronicle with the unselfish decision of Judge Kennedy and want to include the newspapers' editorial comment at this point in the RECORD:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 23, 1967]

JUDGE KENNEDY STAYS

Municipal Judge Joseph G. Kennedy has elected to stay on as head of the Economic Opportunity Council here. The war on poverty program and the city are fortunate in his having made this decision. Judge Kennedy has had his troubles in running the council through its "period of crisis." Its programs have been much criticized. But the war on poverty is going to go on, and it must have the kind of sound and patient leadership which he can give it—an effort which, as he has said, "requires dedication from many of us."

RECENT EVENTS IN GREECE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, both the San Francisco Examiner and the San Francisco Chronicle have recently printed editorials which give expression to the concern which many of us feel over the recent events in Greece.

The apprehension which is felt can only be heightened by reports of political prisoners being exiled to the islands in the Aegean, rumors of pending executions, the censoring of the press, and the collapse of constitutional government which has been supplanted by military rule.

Let us hope that the nation which gave birth both to the concept and to the term "democracy" will remember its great traditions and its golden age and return to the wisdom of Aristotle and Plato.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 27, 1967]

GREEK TRAGEDY?

The word "democracy" is derived from the Greek words "demos"—the people—and "kratos"—rule. Aristotle defined democracy as: "... A state where the freemen and the poor, being in the majority, are invested with the power of the state ... every department of government being alike open to all ... the people are the majority, and what they vote is law ..."

This was part of the great Greek heritage handed down to modern times by the most dazzling era of philosophy in history.

Thus it is ironical and perplexing to read of a takeover of government in Greece by the country's armed forces and the estab-

lishment—in the city of Aristotle—of a military dictatorship.

The Greek generals claim that left-wing politicians were leading Greece to disaster. This may be so. But it is disturbing to realize that a military clique has taken upon itself the right to abolish constitutional government, impose martial law and seize "political" prisoners—in the name of the "national interest."

This is not the way of democracy or civilization.

Greece's friends and allies throughout the world await the return of democracy to the land of its birth.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

THE UGLY, CLOUDY STORY OF GREECE

The fact that Greece has for the moment become a military dictatorship is the one certainty that can be gleaned through the censorship that the new regime imposed upon Greece when it suspended the constitution and rounded up several thousand of its political opponents for exile to bleak Aegean islands.

It may be inferred, however, that a threat of civil war overhangs the nation where democracy was born and where another struggle for power has again hustled it aside. Such a war, at a time when Cyprus is still an unresolved issue, might well produce complications of broad dimensions.

Among the major uncertainties of the existing Greek situation are the precise attitude of the young King Constantine and the probable future of his arch opponents, the aged George Papandreou, former prime minister, and his son, Andrea, a former University of California economist who resigned his U.S. citizenship to enter Greek politics.

The King is variously reported as having forbidden the military coup d'etat, as having reluctantly accepted it as a fait accompli, and as approving its design and achievements. The Papandreous, father and son, have been reported as seriously wounded by their captors, as being under arrest, under medical care, and facing trial on grave but unspecified charges.

The King has appeared briefly in public since the coup, but has not spoken out. His silence is credibly explained as prompted by fears that a forthright declaration, for or against the military dictatorship might well stir up public discord that could lead to civil war. It is likewise felt that a similar outbreak would follow proof of harm to George as Andreas Papandreou—a possibility not weakened by the circumstance that leaders of the military coup have specifically attributed it to the growing popularity and influence of these two anti-monarchists.

As of the moment, however, the land of Pericles and Plato is more or less resignedly accepting the kind of despotic rule associated with Mussolini, Franco and its own Metaxas—a rule under which newspapers are censored, radios must not be used, buildings are subject to search without warrant, political offenders are tried by military courts, firearms must be surrendered, and the dress and church attendance of the young are regulated and overseen.

IMAGINATIVE POST OFFICE PROPOSAL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General O'Brien's plan to

convert the Post Office into a nonprofit Government corporation has been saluted by the *Elizabeth Daily Journal* as "imaginative" and "worthy of close study by Congress." I know that the proposal has aroused great interest on Capitol Hill and I am sure it will get the serious consideration it deserves from the Congress. I have permission to insert the *Daily Journal's* comments on the O'Brien plan in the RECORD:

IMAGINATIVE POST OFFICE PROPOSAL

Postmaster General O'Brien is so right in saying that if America's telephone system operated like the Post Office Department does, there still would be a great future for carrier pigeons.

His imaginative proposal for a nonprofit government corporation to take over the mail service is worthy of close study by Congress. The existing operation only gets worse. A new setup could be a change for the better.

The Post Office Department long has been in the stepchild of the government family. Postmasters general have been chief political advisers to presidents, a role Mr. O'Brien fills in the Johnson administration. Congress has played politics both with jobs and with funds. Meanwhile, deterioration of service to the public has been accelerated by a staggering volume of mail, increasing at the rate of three billion pieces annually.

In February, Postmaster General O'Brien told the House Appropriations Committee that the Post Office Department was in a "race with catastrophe. And it is a race that we well could lose, though it is certainly in our power not to lose it."

Recently the House, in the face of Mr. O'Brien's warning, cut \$100 million from a postal appropriation bill. And proposed rate increases are running into opposition in Congress.

From predecessors, at least, Postmaster General O'Brien gets sympathy. Speaking with the voices of experience, J. Edward Day, President Kennedy's postmaster general, and Arthur Summerfield, who held the post in the Eisenhower administrations, are critical of penny-pinching by Congress.

Adoption of the corporation idea of Mr. O'Brien could be the means of placing post office operations on a more realistic basis. The management would be headed by a professional executive, working under a board of directors appointed by the president and confirmed by Congress.

Subsidy rates would be set for various postal services. Any deficits would have to be made up by congressional appropriation.

With a corporation taking over, a drastic break with politics and custom would be possible. This could be the salvation of the mail service.

FLORIDA SENATE MEMORIAL 73— A UNIQUE FEDERAL-STATE REVENUE-SHARING PLAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to submit a memorial passed by the Senate of the State of Florida regarding a unique Federal-State revenue-sharing plan.

This plan was offered by Senator Richard Stone, of Miami. Senator Stone

is to be commended for his unique proposal. I have been associated with this idea for some time and have proposed my own legislation in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I place at this point in the RECORD Senate Memorial 73 so that all of my colleagues and those who read this RECORD will have an opportunity to consider this tax-sharing program:

SENATE MEMORIAL BILL 73

A memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide for amending the United States tax laws so as to rebate and pay to each of the States an amount equal to one-half of the Federal taxes collected on alcoholic beverages and tobacco sold within such State.

Whereas, the president of the United States and the congressional leaders of both major political parties have referred approvingly to "tax sharing" and to "creative federalism" under which concepts the taxpayers of each state who also are taxpayers to the federal government regain some of the federal tax revenue at the state level without any interference on the part of federal agencies in the expenditure of these funds, and

Whereas, as one of the fastest growing states in the nation, the needs of Florida for funds for education, for fighting crime and for other urgent requirements of vibrant communities are pressing in on the sources of state and local taxation to the limits of the abilities of the citizens to pay, and recognizing that such needs are of far greater importance to this country than are those of the recipients of foreign aid in similar amounts, and

Whereas, the program recommended herein has its parallel in the remission to the states of a portion of the federal estate tax which benefits Florida to the extent of at least ten million dollars (\$10,000,000.00) per year with no objectionable conditions attached thereto, and

Whereas, the collection of the federal excise taxes on alcoholic beverages and on tobacco is accomplished at the source of production or immediately thereafter, and in amounts which, if divided one half (½) to each state in proportion to the sales therein would meet the unsatisfied needs of each state which have resulted from the ebb and flow of population stimulated by national mobility of citizens, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend Title 26 of the United States Code so as to provide that one half (½) of total excise tax collections levied thereunder by the federal government on alcoholic beverages and tobacco shall be remitted and paid to the general fund of each of the several states pro rata as to the amounts of sales of such commodities sold in each state without federal conditions imposed on the expenditure of such funds by the states.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY HEARINGS ON THE MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that on Wednesday, May 3, 1967, a third hearing will be held

by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality on the immigration aspects of the international educational exchange program, beginning at 10 a.m. in room 2141.

At the last hearing a representative of the American Medical Association, Dr. John C. Nunemaker, outlined the role played in the program by hospitals in the United States. He also explained that most of the responsibility for selection of participants and allotment of program numbers lies with the State Department.

Dr. Nunemaker explained that while the program seems to be doing well in most instances, it does in fact have some loopholes. He states:

While there are many adequate programs of selection and placement as well as counseling and supervision of foreign physicians operating under the Federal Government or related agencies, the majority of foreign physicians come to this country as free agents without the backing of their medical schools or ministries of health and find their way into internships and resident programs sponsored by private agencies.

Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Dr. Charles Frankel will testify at the hearing.

Knowing that the greatest responsibility for the international educational exchange program is in the hands of Dr. Frankel, we on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality look forward to his enlightening evaluation. In past hearings several significant and perplexing questions were posed concerning whether the intent of existing legislation was and is being implemented. The hearings are aimed at defining any existing problems.

FOREIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be chairman, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has released its findings after several weeks of hearings last fall and again this spring on the foreign policy aspects of the Kennedy round. I would like to make some comment on these findings.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee learned that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was passed with an excess of optimism about what could be accomplished in liberalizing foreign trade. The act granted the President the power to negotiate an across-the-board reduction, with just a few exceptions, of up to 50 percent. The premise on which it was based was that the European Common Market, with England as its newest member, would be anxious to join the United States in quickening the pace of world trade, for

the benefit of producer and consumer alike.

As it happened, England was not admitted to the Common Market. More important, the Common Market showed itself to be more involved with its own internal economic and political problems than with liberalizing world trade. As a consequence, we shall not achieve the goal of 50 percent. Indeed, at this point, it is not at all certain that we will even reach an agreement with the Common Market. Negotiating authority under the Trade Expansion Act expires on June 30 and agreement still seems distant, at best. The question that now arises is how much we can salvage under the act and what are the next steps that we can pursue.

Let me say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the level of tariff reduction often mentioned as obtainable is 25 percent. I would be satisfied with that amount for several reasons. The first is that such an agreement will maintain the momentum of world trade liberalization, which a deadlock will reverse. The second is that, realistically, 25 percent is a significant improvement over previous rounds of negotiations. I regard 25 percent with a minimum of exceptions as a figure salutary in itself, meaningful enough that it suggests good prospects for continued progress in reducing trade barriers.

I would like to say further that if Europe has had its political problems in presenting negotiable offers to us, then surely it must be admitted that we, too, have had our problems in submitting our offers to the EEC. We went to Geneva determined to protect certain segments of our economy. The feed grain growers was one of them. The chemical industry was another. I am not passing on the merits of these special concerns, but I might observe that if their merit had been weighed against the broader interest then it is possible that we would have an agreement by now. I believe we had tended to forget that there are some 190 million Americans, all consumers, who should have received overall consideration. The sum total of the special interests represented at Geneva does not necessarily equal the national interest.

I regret that our negotiators took the position that they had to look out for this or that area of agriculture or industry and did not properly look out for the 190 million Americans who might have benefited from across-the-board reductions. Had this been the outlook, we would long since have left Geneva with an agreement in our pocket.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unaware of the importance, in human as well as monetary values, to seeing that certain areas of the economy receive some special consideration. But for various political reasons, we find it easier to use tariff barriers rather than other more positive devices to achieve this end. We hear much complaint about Government subsidies—but testimony in our hearings disclosed that certain subsidies could, in the long run, be far more advantageous than high tariffs. We have an adjustment-assistance provision in the Trade Expansion Act but business firms and workers have never been able to use this device.

These examples suggest that the protection we have traditionally sought to extend by tariff could far more appropriately be extended by other means.

What this leads me to conclude, Mr. Speaker, is that we ought to look more closely into our own domestic economic practices before we indulge excessively in blame for disappointment in the Kennedy round. It is not the domain of my committee, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that we in the Congress have the obligation to examine some of the practices to which we have become wedded—perhaps they are not justified. I think there are some sacred cows in our economy that exploit the American consumer with the Government's help. I also recognize that there are weak spots in our economy which need further help from the Congress. I would like to see a study made of America's responsibility—quite apart from the responsibility of the EEC—for any failure of the Kennedy round to achieve its potential. These findings would serve as a basis for directing new U.S. policy efforts to stimulate world trade.

What these hearings did reveal to me, Mr. Speaker, was that trade liberalization remains a valid goal, one that is in the national interest. I think it is important to pursue that goal. I would like to get from the administration without undue delay its recommendations for steps to be taken after the Kennedy round. Then I would like the Congress to undertake a thorough study of how we can achieve our objectives in a fashion most equitable to the American people, all 190 million of them. My subcommittee will do its part in examining the foreign policy implications of further changes. There is much work for my distinguished colleagues on other committees.

My final word, Mr. Speaker, contains a plea to Congress and the administration not to let the Kennedy round fail. I recognize, of course, that the bargaining at Geneva is a two-way street and that success or failure depends not on us alone. But if, as we race to the end of this long and tedious session, we see the prospect of a resolution in sight, I trust that we will not let it elude us by a terminal deadline.

I urge the administration to count on keeping its men at the bargaining table as long as the possibility of success remains. For my part, I will do my best to help keep them there.

HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times magazine of April 30 published an article on Vietnam, by Max Frankel, entitled "How Long Will It Last?" Mr. Frankel, a member of the New York Times Washington bureau,

whose regular assignment is the White House, is one of the ablest reporters in Washington. His article is a penetrating analysis of the Vietnam situation. As we seem to move further and further away from a negotiated settlement, Mr. Frankel's article should be read by all of us.

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON.—How long will it last? How could it possibly end? Will bombing Haiphong make them say "Ouch" or "Nuts"? Will grazing Hanoi soften them up or merely annoy? Let's pacify. Let's mortify. Let's escalate so as to negotiate.

In most wars, the armchairs are full of generals refighting every battle, recasting every strategy, second-guessing every field commander. But Vietnam, being different in virtually every other sense as well, has also produced a new kind of kibitzer—the armchair diplomat. The galleries in this war are crowded mostly with mediators who second-guess, not the warriors but the negotiators, and spin many an intricate design not for winning the war but for ending it.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy would end the bombing briefly. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. would stop the shooting unilaterally. Gen. James Gavin would huddle in enclaves. Senator Wayne Morse would summon the United Nations. Senator J. W. Fulbright has eight points. Secretary-General U Thant has three. Walter Lippmann has variations on one. The New York Times editorial page has one after another.

Most of the sideline proposals represent a degree of protest against the war or the military tactics with which it is being waged. Invariably, however, the amateur suggestions have been borrowed, imitated or supplanted by the diplomats of the belligerents—Ho Chi Minh's four points and Dean Rusk's 14—so that at any one time there are usually more peace plans than bombs in the air.

What is more, a large number of the sideline brokers really abhor the sedentary role. Ministers, journalists, scholars or officials of wholly uninvolved or even uninterested governments periodically leap from their armchairs and fly about the world seeking out the combatants, carrying messages to and fro, adding their own interpretations of what they hear, or think they hear, and propounding yet another formula for peace.

In the spirit of referees everywhere, these intermediaries generally profess objectivity, and often make a good claim for it, thus incurring the wrath of now one side, now the other. Washington has learned to hide its scorn and to speak respectfully even of the once deeply resented U Thant, although President Johnson and Secretary Rusk still mumble contemptuously about all the "self-appointed candidates for the Nobel Peace Prize."

Yet the same kind of peace games are regularly played also inside the American Government and, if recent hints are to be believed, inside the Government of North Vietnam. Both are regularly confronted, it seems, by "scenarios" to step up the war, to step down the war or, in various ways, to interrupt the war—all presented as the quickest way to conclude the war.

So insistent are the discussions of how best to end the war, it is sometimes forgotten that all the active belligerents have a prior interest in winning the peace, not simply making it. In fact, the fighting itself is often dismissed by the mediators as a matter quite separate from the quest for a settlement. In some quarters, every new form of military pressure is automatically deemed hostile to peace; in others, every suggestion of striking a bargain is seen as a betrayal of the military cause.

The result of all this is that the prospects of peace are, like the objectives of war, being debated in a semantic jungle as dense as the most overgrown terrain in Vietnam itself. Every day someone is urging one side or the other to escalate or to de-escalate, to de-augment and to disinfiltate, to pause temporarily or unconditionally and, above all, to negotiate. On paper, at least, it is time to defoliate.

This war, like any other, could end in a dozen different ways, planned or unplanned, the result of the war itself or of some wholly irrelevant development far away. We can only guess how it will end and when, but some sense of the possibilities and probabilities underlies every informed choice of tactics on all sides.

The semantic defoliation might best begin with the genus *neg-otium*, the Latin root of "negotiate," meaning "not easy."

A hawk wanting to sound reasonably dove-ish—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor while serving as United States Ambassador in Saigon—once said of Vietnam that all wars end by negotiations. Whatever his hopes at the time, the general knew better, of course. Wars do not always end by negotiation. They also end in capitulation or annihilation or both. And if you asked a Vietnamese below the age of 25, he might speak from the fullness of his experience and reply that some wars never end.

If there is any point in speculation about whether this war will ever end, and how, it would help to ban the word "negotiate" altogether. It was once both meaningful and respectable, but of late it has become the catch-all slogan of all too many irreconcilable notions. Men who really dream of total military victory, like Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam, offer to "negotiate" while really imagining only some ceremony of surrender. Men who really wish the United States would get out, like Walter Lippmann, talk of "negotiation" because they deem the word politically more neutral than "withdrawal."

Indeed, for the major antagonists in the war, periodic offers to "negotiate" have been largely extensions of the military conflict—verbal and diplomatic ploys aimed at achieving a more advantageous battlefield position.

In his recent letter to President Ho, President Johnson offered relief from the bombing of North Vietnam and assurances of no further American troop build-ups in South Vietnam if only Hanoi would let the Communist forces of 280,000 men fight unopposed and unreplenished against the allied forces of one million. And President Ho replied that if the bombing of his country stopped unconditionally, he might consider talking about how the 450,000 American forces are to be withdrawn from the battle as the first step toward a settlement.

One can argue about this or that interpretation of this or that element in the avalanche of peace proposals. But it is no mere coincidence that throughout the war, the most vigorous invitations to "negotiate" have come from the side that saw itself in a militarily superior, or at least potentially superior, position—North Vietnam until February, 1965, and the United States since April, 1965. And the potentially weaker side has been reluctant or downright deaf.

Now one side, now the other, has been only too willing to "negotiate" what amounted to a face-saving retreat by the other, and both sides have clearly understood this, even when the armchair peacemakers around the world have not.

At various times, in fact, both sides have been confident that a mere agreement to "negotiate" by the other would significantly injure the morale of its military forces and allies, so that getting the enemy's agreement to "negotiate" has at times been this war's direct equivalent of his crying "uncle."

Back in the autumn of 1964, when Hanoi was offering peace talks while the Johnson Administration gagged every time it tried to pronounce the word "negotiation," Secretary Rusk once remarked that the anti-Communist forces were then so weak and near to total defeat that he would rather just quit and run than "negotiate" his own humiliation.

And similarly today, as they confidently propose "negotiation" to the Communist side, American officials think that the same logic is probably at work in Hanoi. Deep down, they believe—and also hope—in Washington that when North Vietnam comes to terms with its own predicament it will choose to quit the battlefield as quietly as it arrived rather than sign an agreement that would define the proportions of its failure.

"Negotiation" in its original sense meant "not easy," that is, a difficult process of bargaining in which parties who want something roughly comparable from each other sit down and haggle about the price and the wording of the contract. If ever both sides in a war need peace badly enough simultaneously, then the conflict may well end in a bargain that leaves both equally satisfied or frustrated or both. But we had better call this process "bargaining" to distinguish it from the now debased slogan of "negotiation." The concept of a hard and difficult bargain is useful also because it vividly suggests that a real deal is far from the only possible end of the Vietnam saga.

A bargain requires a coincidence of interest and a balance of power that is only seldom achieved in war diplomacy—and rarely recognized in time even when the coincidence occurs. Americans have not genuinely bargained for the end of a war since 1815, and even that war's settlement with the British merely acknowledged a military stalemate and left most of the real issues for subsequent resolution.

The prospects for a bargain in Vietnam are especially remote because on each side of the conflict there are allies pursuing noticeably different objectives. Thus, the conflict really encompasses two distinguishable—though no longer separate—wars. It is hard to present even to imagine how they could be sorted out in a bargain involving the four principal belligerents.

One war is between the so-called National Liberation Front (N.L.F.) and the so-called Government of South Vietnam, or more accurately Army of the Republic of Vietnam (A.R.V.N.). It is a battle for power—for territory and, above all, direct authority over the people living in the southern half of Vietnam—waged by military, political and economic means.

Unfortunately for those who are trying to design a deal, or even merely to blow the whistle and arrange a standstill, this war has not produced two readily definable encampments between whom the spoils of territory and population might be divided. Neither the N.L.F. nor the A.R.V.N. rules effectively in clearly delineated or contiguous hunks of territory or over divisible groups of people. They hold a town here and a village there, reign in a province there and a district here, control a road by day or a river by night.

Not now, and not in the foreseeable future, therefore, can the fighting between them be ended by any conceivable scheme of partition, as in Laos five years ago.

Nor is there any significant third or neutral force in South Vietnam to which the two rival forces might be persuaded or compelled to submit. The N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. are the only two effective "national" institutions that could even pretend to power in South Vietnam, and their writ rarely extends farther into the countryside than the length of their bayonets.

War No. 2 is between North Vietnam and the United States. Though bloodier than the

first, it is nonetheless an ancillary contest in which each side is trying to defeat, or at least to nullify, the power of the other so as to leave itself free to assist its ally in war No. 1. The second war has not only complicated the tactics of the conflict, it has raised the stakes by injecting the prestige of two proud Governments. Moreover, to real interests, it has added issues of principle ("wars of liberation must be defeated once and for all") and ideology ("anticolonial wars are just and thus inevitably successful"). And behind each of the ancillary contestants there now stands a host of allies, involved in varying degrees, with varying stakes in the outcome.

Not only the four principal antagonists but at least a dozen other nations could now rightly claim a seat at a Vietnam peace conference. And even if they ever did manage to come together, the presence of the Soviet Union and Communist China alone—allegedly on the same side of the table—would quickly plunge the meeting into cacophonous chaos.

Those who call for "negotiations" cannot shake off these realities. They may, nonetheless, try to arrange a real bargain but they must deal with the real issues to be bargained about, not merely with the simple notions of finding a time and place for a meeting.

The problem, as they say in professional diplomatic establishments, is substantive, not procedural. There are already ample channels of communication between Hanoi and Washington, direct and indirect through other capitals and governments, as the Johnson-Ho exchange showed. The N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. could probably exchange messages between any two waiters in a Saigon hotel.

Nor is there any shortage of intermediaries, professional or amateur. Besides the wandering minstrels and journalists, there are the Canadian, Indian and Polish members of the International Control Commission for Indochina shuttling around the capitals of the region, including Hanoi and Saigon. There are the so-called co-chairmen of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Conferences on Indochina, the Soviet Union and Britain; dozens of nonaligned and moderately aligned governments seeking peace or merely self-importance; U Thant, and even the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Their inquiries and invitations to peace talks have produced a record of rejections and conditions by one side or the other that clearly suggests no lack of understanding. Indeed, the record suggests that the belligerents have understood each other only too well. No mere lack of communication and no mere insistence on ceremony has blocked the path to peace. The central issue remains what it was as this war began, and it remains the focus of contest: Who shall hold sway in South Vietnam?

The problem, not some exaggerated sense of protocol or pride, accounts for the celebrated reluctance of the United States to deal directly with the N.L.F. and for the less celebrated but equally firm refusal of North Vietnam to deal with the leaders of the A.R.V.N. If either of the contestants in the second war were to deal with the enemy's ally in the first war, it would be conceding an essential piece of the peace—a share of the power in South Vietnam that both the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. continue to claim exclusively.

Who talks to whom is thus not a minor matter of form but something close to the essence of the conflict.

In this situation, only two types of bargain are really conceivable.

To end the first war by compromise, the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. would have to agree to share power in some kind of genuine coalition arrangement. "Coalition," too, is a tricky word because the virtual defeat of one side

or the other might some day be concealed in a clearly pro-Communist coalition such as those that rule in Eastern Europe or a clearly anti-Communist coalition of the type sometimes seen in Western Europe. But a real compromise in the foreseeable future would require a real coalition of a kind never before effectively constructed anywhere between Communists and non-Communists, even in situations of lesser passion.

The coalition arranged for Laos at the Geneva Conference in 1962 is not an apt precedent. It never worked in fact, and it worked on paper only because a middle-of-the-road, or so-called neutralist, faction could be assigned a central role in the coalition, and because a virtual demarcation line could be drawn between the territories held by Communist, non-Communist and anti-Communist forces on the ground.

The advocates of a bargain in Vietnam must face up to the design of a viable coalition. So far, they have not done so and none of the major parties to the war has given them any ground for hope. The United States Government decided long ago that a coalition was unworkable, undesirable and therefore unacceptable. The military leaders of South Vietnam have said they would never agree to a coalition. The leaders of the National Liberation Front have spoken of a coalition, but never of one that would assign even a minority place to their principal antagonists in Saigon and usually only of a coalition in which they would have a dominant voice.

Senator Kennedy came close to proposing a coalition in his first critical appraisal of the war more than a year ago, when he said the Vietcong would eventually have to be offered a "share" of the power in South Vietnam, but he backed away from suggestions that he meant a Laotian-type of coalition and has let the idea languish without further development. No one else has developed it either.

It has been suggested in many quarters that the political and ethnic and religious factions of South Vietnam might yet work out an acceptable means of governing themselves if only they were left to their own devices or if a Buddhist Government were deliberately installed in Saigon in place of the military and encouraged to bargain directly with the N.L.F.

The trouble with this is that neither the Buddhists nor any other faction has demonstrated any capacity to organize or administer a larger portion of South Vietnam than the A.R.V.N.; on the contrary, the indications are that the A.R.V.N. would forcibly destroy such a movement, if only in the interests of physical self-preservation. Nor have any of the anti-military and anti-Communist groups shown themselves capable of dealing constructively with the N.L.F. or willing to defect to it. There simply is no meaningful third force around which to build.

The United States' answer to this problem has been to encourage the transformation of the present military Government into a more civilian, more legitimate and more charitable regime that might eventually come to resemble a "third force." By encouraging the proclamation of a new Constitution, the holding of national elections and a policy of national reconciliation or amnesty, the officials of Washington and Saigon hope gradually to lure many of the N.L.F.'s political and military cadres to their own ranks, or at least toward more conventional and peaceful political contest.

But such reconciliation is a long-range process. And if it worked, it would really represent a military and psychological as well as political defeat for the N.L.F., resulting in a bogus, rather than genuine, coalition with supremacy assured for the anti-Communist forces.

The only other conceivable bargain that could be struck in the near future would

be aimed at ending war No. 2 between North Vietnam and the United States.

Since neither seems willing to leave the South Vietnam battlefield to the other, such a bargain would have to arrange for their simultaneous and genuine withdrawal from the contest, leaving the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. to slug it out alone. This has been the objective of most of the "negotiating" formulas advanced from the sidelines over the years.

Such a bargain is obstructed, first, by the reluctance of both North Vietnam and the United States to withdraw from the conflict, even in a fair deal, so long as their respective allies, the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N., would be left to the mercy of the other. Something close to perfect parity between the rival South Vietnamese belligerents would have to exist, or be thought to exist, if Hanoi and Washington are to be persuaded to keep hands off at this late stage.

Even if some prolonged period of delicate balance could be imagined, a second major difficulty would develop around the meaning of "hands off" or "withdrawal."

Would every "Northerner"—that is, even a native Southerner trained in guerrilla warfare in the North and then sent South again to fight—have to retire from the battlefield before North Vietnam was considered to have withdrawn from the war?

Would every C.I.A. agent or other American "adviser" have to sail for home before the United States was considered to have withdrawn?

Could neither side ship weapons and ammunition to its allies in the continuing war No. 1? And if not weapons, uniforms? Or medical supplies? Or rice?

And who, conceivably, could inspect and enforce such unimaginable restraint by two Governments that have already spent so much blood and treasure in their respective interventions?

Yet these are the issues that would have to be resolved in the design of an ancillary bargain to end the ancillary war in Vietnam.

The seed of such a deal was perhaps planted in the Manila declaration of the United States and its allies last October, promising that American forces would be withdrawn "as" the North Vietnamese withdrew and as the level of violence "thus" subsided. The last of the Americans, it was promised after some logistic calculations, could be shipped out within six months after the last of the North Vietnamese had departed.

This declaration, however, was more in the nature of a vague assurance that the United States sought no permanent bases in Vietnam than a serious bargaining position. The horrendous difficulties of defining the proposition and of policing such an arrangement have left Hanoi and Washington equally, and understandably, cold to it.

So much, then, for a direct bargain in which any two or all four of the main antagonists would deal more or less equally with each other in arranging a major reduction or total cessation of the fighting. A "negotiated" or genuinely bargained settlement does not now loom among the more likely prospects. Nor did it ever.

This is a conclusion that can be reached even by those who disagree about the origins of the war, the nature of the war or the wisdom of United States involvement, in it. Barring gross ineptitude by one of the negotiating parties, no conference-table bargain can ever achieve what the soldiers and other men of power have failed to achieve.

In Vietnam today, there is neither a decisive victory by one side nor a stable, well-nigh unbreakable stalemate of the two sides. Each side still expects either its own victory or the enemy's exhaustion and these are not attitudes that can be translated or bargained into a settlement.

The result, as the most sober men on both sides have long recognized, is a bitter and determined war of attrition, a negotiation by fire.

To recognize that fact is not to condone it, but the overwhelming odds are that one of the sides in this war will have to be forced and mightily persuaded to yield effective rule in South Vietnam to the other before the war can end.

Such an end may ultimately be ratified at one or more surrender ceremonies disguised as "negotiations" or it may simply happen through the stealthy retreat of the North Vietnamese and their allies.

Either kind of end could come through an important change in the context of the war—the death of one or more of the most persistent advocates of the war in Hanoi or Washington or their effective political defeat at home or a sudden choking off in the supplies of war due to upheaval in Moscow or Peking or economic depression in the United States.

Any such dramatic event—comparable to the death of Stalin, which seemed to clear the way for acceptance of stalemate in Korea—could lead sooner than anyone now expects to the withdrawal of the United States or North Vietnam, since neither would risk conquest or subjugation even if it quit entirely. But upheavals cannot, by definition, be predicted. Each side maneuvers to be in position to take advantage of such a break, but in the meantime it must reckon on altering the balance of power in South Vietnam by direct and bloody action.

To force an end of the war by direct action, both sides must think in terms of the risks and opportunities of fighting a significantly larger or wider war, a significantly smaller or more limited war, or the kind of war euphemistically called "more of the same."

The N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. are now fighting at virtually peak capacity, militarily and politically. A more intensive war, therefore, could result only from the action of their respective allies.

North Vietnam could send the bulk of its 300,000-man army to join its 50,000 troops in South Vietnam, thus risking the virtually total destruction of its country from much more massive bombing by the United States, a much larger, more or less conventional ground war against a still further augmented allied force in the South and possibly a counterinvasion of its territory.

It would be risking enormous losses and at least eventual military defeat against the rather slim chance that a much bigger war would be suddenly repudiated or abandoned by the United States.

Communist China or the Soviet Union or both could further intensify the war by intervening openly with "volunteer" or regular forces, but they would thus risk retaliation against their home territories while, at best, prolonging the war and denying the United States an outright victory. Only the rapid escalation of such an enlarged war toward a worldwide or nuclear conflict could so frighten all parties that it would increase rather than further injure the chances of compromise.

With every form of Communist escalation certain to be matched or doubled by the United States, it seems much more likely that the Communist tacticians would seek advantages in a smaller war of sporadic guerrilla assault, terror, and political action, aimed not so much at winning or ending the conflict as at prolonging it past the point of American endurance.

Taken to its logical extreme, this strategy could even lead to a North Vietnamese decision to quit the war altogether—though only temporarily—by yielding South Vietnam and somehow bargaining most American troops out of the country while planning to mount a new assault a few years later, when Washington would have turned its attention to

other matters and presumably lost all taste for a resumption of the war.

There have been some suspicions in Washington that this is precisely what the Russians have urged upon North Vietnam, and that at least a few leading officials in Hanoi have been willing to listen.

To guard against this possibility, the United States has placed ever more emphasis on the political and economic measures that could assure the survival of a non-Communist Government in Saigon and arm it to withstand such a future challenge without permanent American occupation. However, having paid so dearly for such a North Vietnamese withdrawal and for such a respite in the South, it is unlikely that the United States would soon abandon South Vietnam to its fate until it felt sure of a peace of at least some years.

This leaves North Vietnam and the N.L.F. with only the choice of a major capitulation or "more of the same." By yielding South Vietnam to the A.R.V.N. forces, the Communists could probably buy an amnesty for their own fighters in the South and guarantees of both economic help and physical security from both the United States and the Soviet Union.

But unless their fortunes in war deteriorate rapidly in the next few months—as some Americans insist they will—the Communist leaders are unlikely to seek such an end until they have tested the persistence of the United States through the 1968 election campaign and perhaps even longer.

President Johnson, for one, is convinced that North Vietnam is waiting to win in Washington what it cannot win on the battlefield; that it remains obsessed by the memory of that 100-to-1 shot that scored in 1954 when political collapse in Paris preceded the military collapse of the French forces in Vietnam. The visible unpopularity of the war in the United States, the active opposition of influential men and commentators and the heady notion that conquerors from afar can always be outwitted by defenders of the homeland may indeed sustain the Communist forces beyond all rational military calculations.

The accumulated grievances of two decades, the mistrust of the European white man, the ignorance and suspicion of all Western contracts and of the previous Western-style negotiations in Geneva in 1954 may well endow North Vietnam with the traditional strength of the weak, the sense that survival itself is at stake and that only the enemy has anything left to lose. Hanoi could easily find virtue in the necessity of simply hanging on.

So far, at least, the Johnson Administration has been similarly unwilling to risk a significant enlargement of the war. It has been urged by some of its officials to attack more diligently the routes and even the sources of North Vietnam's military supplies, accepting the risk of harming Soviet ships or a direct Soviet or Chinese intervention.

The larger the war, it has been said, the more decisive the American military superiority. The greater the danger of a Soviet-American clash, it has also been said, the greater the incentive for Moscow to force Hanoi to settle or quit. Such an end may yet be sought by the United States, but less from calculation than desperation. For the moment, Washington does not appear to feel so much pressure that it will rush to that most precipitous brink.

Also before the Administration are proposals for fighting a drastically curtailed kind of war, including a long or indefinite pause in the bombing of North Vietnam and experiments with cease-fires and standstills and retreats to enclaves in South Vietnam.

The answer in Washington to these suggestions is that too many important military battles are being fought and too many political efforts have been mounted now in South

Vietnam for the United States to inhibit or handicap its own troops. Even if gradually reciprocated by North Vietnam, the Administration argues, such restraint would leave the Saigon regime under guerrilla and terror attack before it has had time to consolidate its rule over significant portions of South Vietnam.

Instead, the United States has decided to continue to wear down the insurgents by bombing them into endless flight around the difficult terrain of South Vietnam, destroying their military installations and secret supply depots, killing or luring into defection as many as possible and thus winning time for the creation of a more viable society and government.

That is why the intensified American military action is being accompanied by strong pressure for political evolution, reform and economic stability and development, even in the midst of war.

How, then, will it end? By attrition in South Vietnam or by now unimagined accident in Moscow or Hanoi or Washington or Peking.

How soon? Probably not soon, even if the pace of combat subsides remarkably. For even if the United States is right in thinking itself to be the stronger side now, it cannot hide from the Communist forces what President Johnson knows and concedes.

Though the American military situation is considerably strengthened, he said recently, and though South Vietnam's political maturation will prove helpful, "I think we have a difficult, serious, long-drawn-out, agonizing problem that we do not yet have the answer for."

For the "other side," as it is called, the problem must appear still more difficult, serious, long-drawn-out and agonizing.

LET US GO FORWARD WITH THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today, as we speak, the Teacher Corps is helping the children of poverty in thousands of local school districts throughout this land to gain new and meaningful educational insights.

I am, therefore, proud and pleased to rise in strong support of the provisions for the Teacher Corps, as amended, in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, H.R. 7819.

Contained in part B of title I of this bill is the authorization for payment of teacher-trainee and team-leader salaries. An amendment to the compensation provisions would pay teacher trainees or "interns" \$75 a week plus \$15 a week for each dependent or the lowest salary scale of a school district, whichever is the lower of the two amounts. This lower salary payment underscores the dedication of the Teacher Corps volunteers who are willing to give 2 years of their lives in service to the children attending schools in the most deprived areas of our country. The amendment would also bring Teacher Corps compensation into conformity with the stipend rate for other Federal graduate programs. In this manner, the program would allay

the fears of my colleagues who think that the young people entering the Teacher Corps are interested more in money and a degree than they are in service to the disadvantaged children of our Nation.

I do not think I need to emphasize the importance of the authority to pay the school systems for the team members' compensation. Since the purpose of the Teacher Corps is to supplement the educational staff of schools in poverty areas and to reach the educationally deprived children in those areas, it stands to reason that projects will be requested by the schools which need assistance the most but are least able to afford them.

Therefore, the Federal Government must make it possible for these schools to request and receive the assistance they need.

I believe that the Teacher Corps, which is tied to assisting schools where at least 50 percent of the children come from the lowest socioeconomic families, is one of the most effective methods of providing this assistance. One of the most vital legislative authorities of the program is the Teacher Corps team compensation provision. For those who fear the remote possibility of Federal control which might result from Federal funding, I would point out that the new amendments underscore full local control by local authorities over hiring, firing, and compensation for Teacher Corps teams.

This is a good program; it has proven its merit. It deserves continuation. For these reasons, I support the provisions for the Teacher Corps in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. I urge that my colleagues support these measures and assure the children now being aided of another full year of meaningful educational development.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO SUPPORTS H.R. 7819, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. QUIE has portrayed his "block grant" bill as a boon to State and local school systems, freeing them from the horrors of redtape and Federal control. Unfortunately, on close examination his bill will merely add to the problems currently experienced by our local school officials, not alleviate them.

Section 704(a)(6) of H.R. 8983, the Quie-proposed alternative to the committee-reported H.R. 7819, contains some very interesting language. It provides that any State which desires to receive a "block grant" shall submit a State plan which, among other things, "provides that any local educational agency or other applicant for assistance under this title which is denied such assistance

may have an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency."

What "other applicants" can Mr. QUIE have in mind? Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which his proposal would replace, only local public educational agencies may apply for and receive Federal assistance.

All title I programs are planned by local educational agencies, although they must provide for educationally disadvantaged children attending nonpublic schools.

All textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials acquired under title II are public property and are acquired under the auspices of the public schools, whether they are to be used by public or nonpublic school children and teachers.

All supplementary centers and services planned and operated under title III have as their coordinating agency the local educational agency, even though they may be initially planned by representatives of the cultural and educational resources of the community, public and private.

By allowing "other applicants" for Federal assistance, Mr. QUIE has created potential chaos. Local school systems would no longer have complete control over the education offered to their children. Any organization interested in education—a community action group, for example—could apply to the State education agency for funds to conduct its own educational program, apart from that offered by the public schools. Nonpublic schools—and even profitmaking schools and organizations—could seek direct grants of Federal funds from the States to operate their own educational programs, construct their own facilities, and pay their own teachers. The local school district, at the discretion of the State department of education or the Governor, could be completely bypassed.

Our present system of public education is based on the premise that the control of education in local schools is vested in locally elected school boards who are responsible to the will of the people of the school district. Our present Federal education programs are designed to reinforce this democratic system of education. Every local school board in the Nation is assured that it has exclusive control of all Federal money expended for elementary and secondary education in its school district. This is as it should be.

The proposed substitute would authorize funds for the establishment and operation of competing school systems in any school district where a group—local or otherwise—decided that the public school system did not meet the particular needs of the group. Two years ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] criticized title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because he thought it would set up competing schools—now he offers an amendment which does just what he warned us against 2 years ago.

The QUIE substitute could destroy the whole fabric of local control of education. We must not allow this to happen. Competing school systems must not be allowed to siphon off the funds which

our local school districts need so desperately. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this substitute and to support H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, which reflects the dedication of every Member of this House to the principle of local control of education.

BRINGING THE BLESSINGS OF THE AUTOMOBILE AGE TO THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a major battle is now shaping up in Congress concerning the President's desire to "build bridges" to Eastern Europe in an effort to lessen the tensions of the cold war. One facet of the program is to allow the U.S. Export-Import Bank to finance the export of U.S. machine tools to Fiat of Italy, which would then be used by Fiat to develop an automobile plant in the Soviet Union for the production of some 600,000 Fiats a year.

Last December, as a member of the Foreign Trade Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I went to the Soviet Union to study the Fiat transaction. The members of the subcommittee, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, were generally in favor of the transaction as it would help to move the Soviets toward a more consumer-oriented economy. The CIA reported their approval of the proposal—they are very much in favor of more consumers within the Soviet sphere. Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff liked the idea.

Unfortunately, some of our conservative Congressmen are alarmed and do not want us to participate, although the plant is to be built whether we like it or not, as the United States is not the only country in the world which produces machine tools. My observation is that my recalcitrant colleagues are not aware of the disturbing history of the automobile age. They seem to be blind to what goes on around them. They talk as if they had never financed a car, fixed a flat tire, looked at miles and miles of billboards, tried to get a motel reservation on a Labor Day weekend, breathed in lungs full of foul, smoggy air, spent hours stuck in a freeway traffic jam, or looked futilely for a parking space during the rush hour.

The average Russian has not had to experience any of these "joys" of the automobile age. As a result, he has hours, weeks, and years of leisure in which to contemplate Marx and Mao, Albania and sputnik, and the women's track team.

In Moscow, a city of 6 million souls, there are only eight gas stations and two garages. This is ridiculous; why, I must have 800 gas stations just in my congressional district of half a million souls. And freeways—they do not exist—and I

do not think there is a Russian word for "parking lot," "downpayment," or "woman driver."

To understand the Fiat proposal is really to love it. The opponents of the project cannot be blamed though—they just do not have truly diabolical minds. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA do have diabolical minds—they are in favor—they hope that the project will bring the U.S.S.R. into the automobile age.

The billion-dollar investment in the plant is just the starter—the small lump of heady yeast that will swell into the biggest loaf of questionable progress the world has seen to date.

Just look at highways—they do not have many in the Soviet Union, and what they have are not too good. This will be changed. They must have new roads or the cars will not last. A worker who has sweated and strained years to own a car will expect a road the car will ride on. If the car breaks down the first month there will be hell to pay; the worker will be so frustrated he will not make his quotas. And what about parking lots? Cars must be stored somewhere—especially in Russia or the snow will cover the car and the driver will not be able to find it until after the spring thaw.

And gas stations—there will have to be more than eight in Moscow, or nobody would ever get to work as they would spend all their time in long lines waiting for gas. There would have to be motels along the highways to stay in overnight, and once you have motels, there is no end to the problems that might arise. There will be a new surge of demand for mechanics, and as progress continues, another blessing of the advent of the automobile—the used car salesman—will appear on the scene. As you can see, the true picture of the Fiat deal begins to emerge.

Roads cannot just go along the countryside with no form of visual entertainment for the motorist—so, we have billboards. New radio stations will emerge to entertain—new modes of music since long-winded propaganda programs do little to soothe the harassed motorist. Then we will need sig-alerts to tell the motorist of the latest traffic jams, and helicopters will be pressed into service to spot the traffic jams. There will be more and more traffic jams, more "no parking" areas, and key engineers will be taken away from the moon race to figure out how to coordinate traffic signals.

Suddenly, some Russian engineer will invent the freeway—goodbye Kremlin, goodbye Gorky Park, goodbye Winter Palace—the freeway is coming through.

The smog will get thicker, trash and beer cans will start to accumulate along the vistas of the Black Sea and the Ural Mountains. The teenagers will start borrowing dad's car and there might well be a "Sunset Strip" of discotheques across the street from the Bolshoi. Down the block will be a huge courthouse to take care of cases involving traffic violations and automobile accidents. Across from that will be the emergency hospital for those unfortunates who thought their car was a troika and slammed into a snow bank. The hospital will also take care

of ulcers and nervous disorders caused by the financial pressures of not being able to make the car payments or by the frustrations of prolonged traffic jams. The end will be in sight when the Japanese negotiate a license to manufacture Yamaha and Honda motorcycles in Russia.

One can imagine gangs of "Heaven's Angels" with their boots, black leather jackets and top hats emblazoned with gold dollar signs.

Yes, some of us want the Fiat plant to be built in Russia, and are ready to welcome a lot of others—Volkswagen, Cadillac, Reo, Tucker, Renault, Ford, Edsel, Packard, Studebaker, Volvo, and Jaguar. There is no reason why only the United States of America, Western Europe, Japan, and parts of Latin America should experience the joys of the automobile age—we want to export this scourge to all—friend and foe alike. There is no reason on earth why a Russian should be able to breathe fresh air, and see his seashore, lakes, and mountains unencumbered by litter, gas stations, billboards, and car salvage lots. Why should not the Russians have to ruin their cities by allowing the automobile to take over? Do they not deserve the economic poverty brought on by car ownership and the neurosis that has resulted?

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING ON VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the furor which was aroused after the April 4 address at the Riverside Church in New York City by Dr. Martin Luther King is indicative of the stature and force which Dr. King carries in this country. Dr. King's words are of such power and eloquence that I respectfully urge its careful reading by Members of the Congress. We must not let the political debate of superfluous questions—such as the judiciousness of "mixing" the two central issues of our time, civil rights and peace—obscure the depth and wisdom of Dr. King's address.

For anyone who knows the total philosophical and religious view of Martin Luther King knows he could take no other action than to speak out against the role of the United States in Vietnam. In his inspirational remarks, the same quality of compassion, the same ideal of justice, and the same spirit of love which compelled Dr. King to act first in Montgomery and then throughout the South in opposition to laws of segregation and discrimination, prevails.

I have unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Martin Luther King, at the Riverside Church, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point along with an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April

23, 1967. This column, written by Mr. James P. Brown, an editorial writer for the Providence Journal, concisely and clearly cites the reasoning behind Dr. King's stand and explains why clergymen all over this country are concerned about the war in Vietnam.

The speech and editorial follow:

BEYOND VIETNAM

(By Dr. Martin Luther King)

I come to this magnificent house of worship tonight because my conscience leaves me no other choice. I join you in this meeting because I am in deepest agreement with the aims and work of the organization which has brought us together: Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. The recent statement of your executive committee are the sentiments of my own heart and I found myself in full accord when I read its opening lines: "A time comes when silence is betrayal." That time has come for us in relation to Vietnam.

The truth of these words is beyond doubt, but the mission to which they call us is a most difficult one. Even when pressed by the demands of inner truth, men do not easily assume the task of opposing their government's policy, especially in time of war. Nor does the human spirit move without great difficulty against all the apathy of conformist thought within one's own bosom and in the surrounding world. Moreover when the issues at hand seem as perplexing as they often do in the case of this dreadful conflict we are always on the verge of being mesmerized by uncertainty; but we must move on.

Some of us who have already begun to break the silence of the night have found that the calling to speak is often a vocation of agony, but we must speak. We must speak with all the humility that is appropriate to our limited vision, but we must speak. And we must rejoice as well, for surely this is the first time in our nation's history that a significant number of its religious leaders have chosen to move beyond the prophesying of smooth patriotism to the high grounds of a firm dissent based upon the mandates of conscience and the reading of history. Perhaps a new spirit is rising among us. If it is, let us trace its movements well and pray that our own inner being may be sensitive to its guidance, for we are deeply in need of a new way beyond the darkness that seems so close around us.

Over the past two years, as I have moved to break the betrayal of my own silence and to speak from the burnings of my own heart, as I have called for radical departures from the destruction of Viet Nam, many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my path. At the heart of their concerns this query has often loomed large and loud: Why are you speaking about the war, Dr. King? Why are you joining the voices of dissent? Peace and civil rights don't mix, they say. Aren't you hurting the cause of your people, they ask? And when I hear them, though I often understand the source of their concern, I have nevertheless been greatly saddened, for such questions mean that the inquirers have not really known me, my commitment or my calling. Indeed, their questions suggest that they do not know the world in which they live.

In the light of such tragic misunderstanding, I deem it of signal importance to try to state clearly, and I trust concisely, why I believe that the path from Dexter Avenue Baptist Church—the church in Montgomery, Alabama where I began my pastorate—leads clearly to this sanctuary tonight.

I come to this platform tonight to make a passionate plea to my beloved nation. This speech is not addressed to Hanoi or to the National Liberation Front. It is not addressed to China or to Russia.

Nor is it an attempt to overlook the ambiguity of the total situation and the need for a collective solution to the tragedy of Vietnam. Neither is it an attempt to make North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front paragons of virtue, nor to overlook the role they can play in a successful resolution of the problem. While they both may have justifiable reason to be suspicious of the good faith of the United States, life and history give eloquent testimony to the fact that conflicts are never resolved without trustful give and take on both sides.

Tonight, however, I wish not to speak with Hanoi and the NLF, but rather to my fellow Americans who, with me, bear the greatest responsibility in ending a conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

Since I am a preacher by trade, I suppose it is not surprising that I have seven major reasons for bringing Viet Nam into the field of my moral vision. There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Viet Nam and the struggle I, and others, have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor—both black and white—through the Poverty Program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the buildup in Viet Nam and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Viet Nam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such.

Perhaps a more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and to die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. So we watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.

My third reason moves to an even deeper level of awareness, for it grows out of my experience in the ghettos of the north over the last three years—especially the last three summers. As I have walked among the desperate, rejected, and angry young men I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through non-violent action. But they asked—and rightly so—what about Viet Nam? They asked if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today—my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of the hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent.

For those who ask the question, "Aren't

you a Civil Rights leader?" and thereby mean to exclude me from the movement for peace, I have this further answer. In 1957 when a group of us formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, we chose as our motto: "To save the soul of America." We were convinced that we could not limit our vision to certain rights for black people, but instead affirmed the conviction that America would never be free or saved from itself unless the descendants of its slaves were loosed completely from the shackles they still wear. In a way we were agreeing with Langston Hughes, that black bard of Harlem, who had written earlier:

"O, yes,
I say it plain,
America never was America to me,
And yet I swear this oath—
America will be!"

Now, it should be incandescently clear that no one who has any concern for the integrity and life of America today can ignore the present war. If America's soul becomes totally poisoned, part of the autopsy must read Viet Nam. It can never be saved so long as it destroys the deepest hopes of men the world over. So it is that those of us who are yet determined that America will be are led down the path of protest and dissent, working for the health of our land.

As if the weight of such a commitment to the life and health of America were not enough, another burden of responsibility was placed upon me in 1964; and I cannot forget that the Nobel Prize for Peace was also a commission—a commission to work harder than I had ever worked before for the "brotherhood of man." This is a calling that takes me beyond national allegiances, but even if it were not present I would yet have to live with the meaning of my commitment to the ministry of Jesus Christ. To me the relationship of this ministry to the making of peace is so obvious that I sometimes marvel at those who ask me why I am speaking against the war. Could it be that they do not know that the good news was meant for all men—for communist and capitalist, for their children and ours, for black and for white, for revolutionary and conservative? Have they forgotten that my ministry is in obedience to the one who loved his enemies so fully that he died for them? What then can I say to the Viet Cong or to Castro or to Mao as a faithful minister of this one? Can I threaten them with death or must I not share with them my life?

Finally, as I try to delineate for you and for myself the road that leads from Montgomery to this place I would have offered all that was most valid if I simply said that I must be true to my conviction that I share with all men the calling to be a son of the Living God. Beyond the calling of race or nation or creed is this vocation of sonship and brotherhood, and because I believe that the Father is deeply concerned especially for his suffering and helpless and outcast children, I come tonight to speak for them.

This I believe to be the privilege and burden of all of us who deem ourselves bound by allegiances and loyalties which are broader and deeper than nationalism and which go beyond our nation's self-defined goals and positions. We are called to speak for the weak, for the voiceless, for victims of our nation and for those it calls enemy, for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our brothers.

And as I ponder the madness of Viet Nam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond in compassion my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them too because it is clear to me that there will be no meaning-

ful solution there until some attempt is made to know them and hear their broken cries.

They must see Americans as strange liberators. The Vietnamese people proclaimed their own independence in 1945 after a combined French and Japanese occupation, and before the communist revolution in China. They were led by Ho Chi Minh. Even though they quoted the American Declaration of Independence in their own document of freedom, we refused to recognize them. Instead, we decided to support France in its re-conquest of her former colony.

Our government felt then that the Vietnamese people were not "ready" for independence, and we again fell victim to the deadly western arrogance that has poisoned the international atmosphere for so long. With that tragic decision we rejected a revolutionary government seeking self-determination, and a government that had been established not by China (for whom the Vietnamese have no great love) but by clearly indigenous forces that included some communists. For the peasants this new government meant real land reform, one of the most important needs in their lives.

For nine years following 1945 we denied the people of Viet Nam the right of independence. For nine years we vigorously supported the French in their abortive effort to re-colonize Viet Nam.

Before the end of the war we were meeting 80% of the French war costs. Even before the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu, they began to despair of the reckless action, but we did not. We encouraged them with our huge financial and military supplies to continue the war even after they had lost the will. Soon we would be paying almost the full costs of this tragic attempt at re-colonization.

After the French were defeated it looked as if independence and land reform would come again through the Geneva agreements. But instead there came the United States, determined that Ho should not unify the temporarily divided nation, and the peasants watched again as we supported one of the most vicious modern dictators—our chosen man, Premier Diem. The peasants watched and cringed as Diem ruthlessly routed out all opposition, supported their extortionist landlords and refused even to discuss reunification with the North. The peasants watched as all this was presided over by U.S. influence and then by increasing numbers of U.S. troops who came to help quell the insurgency that Diem's methods had aroused. When Diem was overthrown they may have been happy, but the long line of military dictatorships seemed to offer no real change—especially in terms of their need for land and peace.

The only change came from America as we increased our troop commitments in support of governments which were singularly corrupt, inept and without popular support. All the while the people read our leaflets and received regular promises of peace and democracy—and land reform. Now they languish under our bombs and consider us—not their fellow Vietnamese—the real enemy. They move sadly and apathetically as we herd them off the land of their fathers into concentration camps where minimal social needs are rarely met. They know they must move or be destroyed by our bombs. So they go—primarily women and children and the aged.

They watch as we poison their water, as we kill a million acres of their crops. They must weep as the bulldozers roar through their areas preparing to destroy the precious trees. They wander into the hospitals, with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for one Vietcong-inflicted injury. So far we may have killed a million of them—mostly children. They wander into the towns and see thousands of the children,

homeless, without clothes, running in packs on the streets like animals. They see the children degraded by our soldiers, as they beg for food. They see the children selling their sisters to our soldiers, soliciting for their mothers.

What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Viet Nam we claim to be building? Is it among these voiceless ones?

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in the crushing of the nation's only non-communist revolutionary political force—the unified Buddhist Church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men. What liberators!

Now there is little left to build on—save bitterness. Soon the only solid physical foundations remaining will be found at our military bases and in the concrete of the concentration camps we call fortified hamlets. The peasants may well wonder if we plan to build our new Viet Nam on such grounds as these? Could we blame them for such thoughts? We must speak for them and raise the questions they cannot raise. These too are our brothers.

Perhaps the more difficult but no less necessary task is to speak for those who have been designated as our enemies. What of the National Liberation Front—that strangely anonymous group we call VC or Communists? What must they think of us in America when they realize that we permitted the repression and cruelty of Diem which helped to bring them into being as a resistance group in the south? What do they think of our condoning the violence which led to their own taking up of arms? How can they believe in our integrity when now we speak of "aggression from the North" as if there were nothing more essential to the war? How can they trust us when now we charge them with violence after the murderous reign of Diem, and charge them with the violence while we pour every new weapon of death into their land? Surely we must understand their feelings even if we do not condone their actions. Surely we must see that the men we supported pressed them to their violence. Surely we must see that our own computerized plans of destruction simply dwarf their greatest acts.

How do they judge us when our officials know that their membership is less than 25 per cent communist and yet insist on giving them the blanket name? What must they be thinking when they know that we are aware of their control of major sections of Viet Nam and yet we appear ready to allow national elections in which this highly organized political parallel government will have no part? They ask how we can speak of free elections when the Saigon press is censored and controlled by the military junta. And they are surely right to wonder what kind of new government we plan to help form without them—the only party in real touch with the peasants. They question our political goals and they deny the reality of a peace settlement from which they will be excluded. Their questions are frighteningly relevant. Is our nation planning to build on political myth again and then shore it up with the power of new violence?

Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and non-violence when it helps us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see

the basic weaknesses of our own condition, and if we are mature, we may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition.

So, too, with Hanoi. In the North, where our bombs now pummel the land, and our mines endanger the waterways, we are met by a deep but understandable mistrust. To speak for them is to explain this lack of confidence in western words, and especially their distrust of American intentions now. In Hanoi are the men who led the nation to independence against the Japanese and the French, the men who sought membership in the French commonwealth and were betrayed by the weakness of Paris and the wilfulness of the colonial armies. It was they who led a second struggle against French domination at tremendous costs, and then were persuaded to give up the land they controlled between the 13th and 17th parallel as a temporary measure at Geneva. After 1954 they watched us conspire with Diem to prevent elections which would have surely brought Ho Chi Minh to power over a united Viet Nam, and they realized they had been betrayed again.

When we ask why they do not leap to negotiate these things must be remembered. Also it must be clear that the leaders of Hanoi considered the presence of American troops in support of the Diem regime to have been the initial military breach of the Geneva Agreement concerning foreign troops, and they remind us that they did not begin to send in any large number of supplies or men until American forces had moved into the tens of thousands.

Hanoi remembers how our leaders refused to tell us the truth about the earlier North Vietnamese overtures for peace, how the President claimed that none existed when they had clearly been made. Ho Chi Minh has watched as America has spoken of peace and built up its forces, and now he has surely heard the increasing international rumors of American plans for an invasion of the North. He knows the bombing and shelling and mining we are doing are part of traditional pre-invasion strategy. Perhaps only his sense of humor and of irony can save him when he hears the most powerful nation of the world speaking of aggression as it drops thousands of bombs on a poor weak nation more than 8,000 miles away from its shores.

At this point I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless on Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called enemy, I am as deeply concerned about our own troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved. Before long they must know that their government has sent them into a struggle among Vietnamese, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create a hell for the poor.

Somehow this madness must cease. We must stop now. I speak as a child of God and brother to the suffering poor of Vietnam. I speak for those whose land is being laid waste, whose homes are being destroyed, whose culture is being subverted, I speak for the poor of America who are paying the double price of smashed hopes at home and death and corruption in Vietnam. I speak as a citizen of the world, for the world as it stands aghast at the path we have taken. I speak as an American to the leaders of my own nation. The great initiative in this war is ours. The initiative to stop it must be ours.

This is the message of the great Buddhist

leaders of Vietnam. Recently one of them wrote these words: "Each day the war goes on the hatred increases in the heart of the Vietnamese and in the hearts of those of humanitarian instinct. The Americans are forcing even their friends into becoming their enemies. It is curious that the Americans, who calculate so carefully on the possibilities of military victory, do not realize that in the process they are incurring deep psychological and political defeat. The image of America will never again be the image of revolution, freedom and democracy, but the image of violence and militarism."

If we continue there will be no doubt in my mind and in the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. It will become clear that our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony and men will not refrain from thinking that our maximum hope is to goad China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations. If we do not stop our war against the people of Vietnam immediately the world will be left with no other alternative than to see this as some horribly clumsy and deadly game we have decided to play.

The world now demands a maturity of America that we may not be able to achieve. It demands that we admit that we have been wrong from the beginning of our adventure in Vietnam, that we have been detrimental to the life of the Vietnamese people. The situation is one in which we must be ready to turn sharply from our present ways.

In order to atone for our sins and errors in Vietnam, we should take the initiative in bringing a halt to this tragic war. I would like to suggest five concrete things that our government should do immediately to begin the long and difficult process of extricating ourselves from this nightmarish conflict:

1. End all bombing in North and South Vietnam.
2. Declare a unilateral cease-fire in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiation.
3. Take immediate steps to prevent other battlegrounds in Southeast Asia by curtailing our military build-up in Thailand and our interference in Laos.
4. Realistically accept the fact that the National Liberation Front has substantial support in South Vietnam and must thereby play a role in any meaningful negotiations and in any future Vietnam government.
5. Set a date that we will remove all foreign troops from Vietnam in accordance with the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

Part of our ongoing commitment might well express itself in an offer to grant asylum to any Vietnamese who fears for his life under a new regime which included the Liberation Front. Then we must make what reparations we can for the damage we have done. We must provide the medical aid that is badly needed, making it available in this country if necessary.

Meanwhile we in the churches and synagogues have a continuing task while we urge our government to disengage itself from a disgraceful commitment. We must continue to raise our voices and our lives if our nation persists in its perverse ways in Vietnam. We must be prepared to match actions with words by seeking out every creative means of protest possible.

As we counsel young men concerning military service we must clarify for them our nation's role in Vietnam and challenge them with the alternative of conscientious objection. I am pleased to say that this is the path now being chosen by more than seventy students at my own Alma Mater, Morehouse College, and I recommend it to all who find the American course in Vietnam a dishonorable and unjust one. Moreover I would encourage all ministers of draft age to give up their ministerial exemptions and seek status as conscientious objectors. These are the times for real choices and not false ones.

We are at the moment when our lives must be placed on the line if our nation is to survive its own folly. Every man of humane convictions must decide on the protest that best suits his convictions, but we must all protest.

There is something seductively tempting about stopping there and sending us all off on what in some circles has become a popular crusade against the war in Vietnam. I say we must enter that struggle, but I wish to go on now to say something even more disturbing. The war in Vietnam is but a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit, and if we ignore this sobering reality we will find ourselves organizing clergy and laymen-concerned committees for the next generation. They will be concerned about Guatemala and Peru. They will be concerned about Thailand and Cambodia. They will be concerned about Mozambique and South Africa. We will be marching for these and a dozen other names and attending rallies without end unless there is a significant and profound change in American life and policy. Such thoughts take us beyond Vietnam, but not beyond our calling as sons of the living God.

In 1957 a sensitive American official overseas said that it seemed to him that our nation was on the wrong side of a world revolution. During the past 10 years we have seen emerge a pattern of suppression which now has justified the presence of U.S. military "advisors" in Venezuela. This need to maintain social stability for our investments accounts for the counter-revolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Colombia and why American napalm and green beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru. It is with such activity in mind that the words of the late John F. Kennedy come back to haunt us. Five years ago he said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

Increasingly, by choice or by accident, this is the role our nation has taken—the role of those who make peaceful revolution impossible by refusing to give up the privileges and the pleasures that come from the immense profits of overseas investment.

I am convinced that if we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin the shift from a "thing-oriented" society to a "person-oriented" society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

A true revolution of values will soon cause us to question the fairness and justice of many of our past and present policies. On the one hand we are called to play the Good Samaritan on life's roadside; but that will be only an initial act. One day we must come to see that the whole Jericho Road must be transformed so that men and women will not be constantly beaten and robbed as they make their journey on Life's highway. True compassion is more than flinging a coin to a beggar; it is not haphazard and superficial. It comes to see that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring. A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the countries, and say: "This is not just." It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of Latin America and say: "This is not just." The Western arrogance of feeling that it has

everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just. A true revolution of values will lay hands on the world order and say of war: "This way of settling differences is not just." This business of burning human beings with napalm, of filling our nation's homes with orphans and widows, of injecting poisonous drugs of hate into the veins of peoples normally humane, of sending men home from dark and bloody battlefields physically handicapped and psychologically deranged, cannot be reconciled with wisdom, justice, and love. A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.

America, the richest and most powerful nation in the world, can well lead the way in this revolution of values. There is nothing, except a tragic death wish, to prevent us from re-ordering our priorities, so that the pursuit of peace will take precedence over the pursuit of war. There is nothing to keep us from molding a recalcitrant status-quo with bruised hands until we have fashioned it into a brotherhood.

This kind of positive revolution of values is our best defense against Communism. War is not the answer. Communism will never be defeated by the use of atomic bombs or nuclear weapons. Let us not join those who shout war and through their misguided passions urge the United States to relinquish its participation in the United Nations. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness. We must not call everyone a Communist or an appeaser who advocates the seating of Red China in the United Nations and who recognizes that hate and hysteria are not the final answers to the problem of those turbulent days. We must not engage in a negative anti-Communism, but rather in a positive thrust for democracy, realizing that our greatest defense against Communism is to take offensive action in behalf of justice. We must with positive action seek to remove those conditions of poverty, insecurity and injustice which are the fertile soil in which the seed of Communism grows and develops.

These are revolutionary times. All over the globe men are revolting against old systems of exploitation and oppression and out of the wombs of a frail world new systems of justice and equality are being born. The shirtless and barefoot people of the land are rising up as never before. "The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light." We in the West must support these revolutions. It is a sad fact that, because of comfort, complacency, a morbid fear of Communism, and our proneness to adjust to injustice, the Western nations that initiated so much of the revolutionary spirit of the modern world have now become the arch anti-revolutionaries. This has driven many to feel that only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit. Therefore, Communism is a judgment against our failure to make democracy real and follow through on the revolutions that we initiated. Our only hope today lies in our ability to recapture the revolutionary spirit and go out into a sometimes hostile world declaring eternal hostility to poverty, racism, and militarism. With this powerful commitment we shall boldly challenge the status-quo and unjust mores and thereby speed the day when "every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain."

A genuine revolution of values means in the final analysis that our loyalties must become ecumenical rather than sectional. Every nation must now develop an overriding loyalty to mankind as a whole in order to preserve the best in their individual societies.

This call for a world-wide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one's tribe, race, class and nation is in reality a call for

an all-embracing and unconditional love for all men. This oft misunderstood and misinterpreted concept so readily dismissed by the Nietzsches of the world as a weak and cowardly force—has now become an absolute necessity for the survival of man. When I speak of love I am not speaking of some sentimental and weak response. I am speaking of that force which all of the great religions have seen as the supreme unifying principle of life. Love is somehow the key that unlocks the door which leads to ultimate reality. This Hindu-Muslim-Christian-Jewish-Buddhist belief about ultimate reality is beautifully summed up in the first epistle of Saint John:

"Let us love one another; for love is God and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us."

Let us hope that this spirit will become the order of the day. We can no longer afford to worship the God of Hate or bow before the altar of retaliation. The oceans of history are made turbulent by the ever-rising tides of hate. History is cluttered with the wreckage of nations and individuals that pursued this self-defeating path of hate. As Arnold Toynbee says: "Love is the ultimate force that makes for the saving choice of life and good against the damning choice of death and evil. Therefore the first hope in our inventory must be the hope that love is going to have the last word."

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life often leaves us standing bare, naked and dejected with a lost opportunity. The "tide in the affairs of men" does not remain at the flood; it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is deaf to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residue of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words: "Too late." There is an invisible book of life that faithfully records our vigilance or our neglect. "The moving finger writes, and having written moves on . . ." We still have a choice today: non-violent co-existence or violent co-annihilation.

We must move past indecision to action. We must find new ways to speak for peace in Vietnam and justice throughout the developing world—a world that borders on our doors. If we do not act we shall surely be dragged down the long dark and shameful corridors of time reserved for those who possess power without compassion, might without morality, and strength without sight.

Now let us begin. Now let us re-dedicate ourselves to the long and bitter—but beautiful—struggle for a new world. This is the calling of the sons of God, and our brothers wait eagerly for our response. Shall we say the odds are too great? Shall we tell them the struggle is too hard? Will our message be that the forces of American life militate against their arrival as full men, and we send our deepest regrets? Or will there be another message, of longing, of hope, of solidarity with their yearnings, of commitment to their cause, whatever the cost? The choice is ours, and though we might prefer it otherwise we must choose in this crucial moment of human history.

As that noble bard of yesterday, James Russell Lowell eloquently stated:

ONCE TO EVERY NATION

"Once to every man and nation,
Comes the moment to decide
In the strife of truth and falsehood
For the good or evil side;
Some great cause God's new Messiah
Offering each the gloom or blight
And the choice goes by forever
Twixt that darkness and that light.

"Though the cause of evil prosper
Yet 'tis truth alone is strong
Though her portion be the scaffold
And upon the throne be wrong
Yet that scaffold sways the future
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above his own."

ANOTHER OPINION—DR. KING'S MORAL STAND

Several months ago I noticed a sign above the desk of a friend who works for the Providence Human Relations Commission. It read:

"If you can keep a cool head in these times, then you just don't understand the situation."

This is as good an answer as I can think of to all the indignant critics, ranging from impassioned civil-rights leaders to pious white racists, who accuse Dr. Martin Luther King of "blowing his cool" because he has spoken out against the war in Vietnam.

Dr. King's critics don't understand the situation. They don't understand Dr. King. They don't understand the civil-rights movement. They don't understand the war in Vietnam. Above all, they fail to perceive the moral thread that ties this man and these causes inescapably together.

Dr. King has been accused of exaggerating when he charged in a speech last April 4 that American firepower in Vietnam may have killed "as many as a million" civilians and when he pointed out a parallel between what Americans are doing in Vietnam today and what the Germans did during World War II.

MINGLING TWO CAUSES

The veteran civil-rights leader is also accused of making a "tactical error" harmful to the movement in trying to mingle two causes which his accusers say "have little in common."

There are elements of truth in these charges. Dr. King apparently took his figures on civilian casualties in Vietnam from a Ramparts magazine article that estimates civilian deaths on the basis of assumptions that are certainly open to question. Dr. King made comparisons between what we are doing now and what Hitler did that could be interpreted by a superficial reader as equating Johnsonian America with Hitler's Germany. The personal involvement of Dr. King, an important symbol of the civil-rights cause, in the anti-Vietnam war movement will certainly mingle the two in the minds of many, to the temporary detriment of the civil-rights cause.

But these are quibbles in terms of the underlying issue. Although Dr. King's estimates of civilian deaths in Vietnam may be exaggerated, there can be no question in the mind of any reasonable person that American forces in Vietnam, no matter how honorable their intentions, are heaping hideous destruction on many thousands of innocent people. Although Americans are not committing the deliberate atrocities that the Nazis committed, our leaders have argued that our ends in Vietnam justify means that are clearly contrary to conscience. We once condemned Hitler for embracing this immoral doctrine.

COMPELLED TO SPEAK OUT

As to the harm Dr. King's unpopular stand on Vietnam may do the civil-rights cause, this is, indeed, tragic. It would have been expedient for Dr. King to keep silent. But Dr. King is not just another Negro fighting for his rights. He is a minister of God, a disciple of the Prince of Peace and of Gandhi. His leadership of the civil-rights movement springs from his moral integrity, not from his skill as a political tactician. As a man of conscience, he is compelled to speak out against the wrong of the Vietnam war just as he has been compelled to stand against the wrong of racial injustice. . . .

Until recently, racial injustice was the central moral issue confronting the conscience of Americans. This issue remains. But it is being overshadowed, and in many ways adversely affected, by the larger moral issue posed by our actions in Vietnam.

There are many for whom it would be expedient not to speak out against the Vietnam war. Politicians, businessmen, teachers, clergymen, editors—all might argue that they have other important tasks that would be compromised if they embraced this unpopular cause. This is no excuse for silence.

Explaining his own strong stand on the Vietnam issue in a recent issue of the Yale Alumni Magazine, Yale Chaplain William Sloane Coffin Jr. wrote:

"If there is such a thing as a just war, then there is such a thing as an unjust war; and whether just or unjust is finally a matter of individual conscience, for no man can properly surrender his conscience to the State. Our Puritan fathers came to these shores because they were committed to this principle. At the Nuremberg trials we faulted an entire nation for not accepting it.

"Now let us suppose that a man has conscientiously done his homework on the war in Vietnam, and that his homework has led him to the following conclusions: that while it is true that we are fighting Communists, it is more profound to say that we have been intervening in another country's civil war; that despite the billions of dollars of aid, the heroic labor and blood of many Americans, the Saigon Government from Diem to Ky has been unable to talk convincingly to its people of national independence, land reform and other forms of social justice; that the war is being waged in a fashion so out of character with American instincts of decency that it is seriously undermining them (which is not to say that the V.C.'s are Boy Scouts, which they clearly are not); that the strains of the war have cut the funds that might otherwise be applied to antipoverty efforts at home and abroad (which is the intelligent way to fight Communism); and finally, that the war would have a good chance of being negotiated to an end were we to stop bombing in North Vietnam.

"If a man's homework leads him to these conclusions, then surely it is not his patriotic duty to cheer or stand silent as good Americans die bravely in a bad cause. . . ."

Like Mr. Coffin, like Rhode Island's Rev. Albert Q. Perry and a growing number of other religious leaders here and elsewhere, Dr. King has answered the call of a higher power. He has put his body on the line.

SUNDAY'S OBSERVANCE OF EASTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last in Washington, in Chicago, in New York, throughout the Nation, Americans of Greek blood or descent and other members of Eastern Orthodox churches celebrated Easter as had earlier generations in Greece with singing, dancing, wining, and feasting. There were scenes reminiscent of celebrations in Greek villages with whole lambs roasting on spits over outdoor fires.

The observances of the Greek Orthodox Easter started on Saturday night and will continue throughout Easter week. It is a season of joyous reunion of friends and families. Since the Orthodox

Lent began on Clean Monday, March 12, a strict fast had been observed, with all animal and dairy products omitted from the menu. Hence the meal on Easter was truly a feast.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on this occasion of the Greek Easter week to recall here on the floor of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States how much we and our country are indebted not only to the Greeks of ancient Greece, the birth country of democracy, but as well to the sons and daughters of modern Greece who have been a vibrant part of our American citizenry and in this day and in our land of America have kept as it was done in earlier days the faith with democracy.

I am extending my remarks to include interesting excerpts from an article by Dorothy P. Jones in the Washington Sunday Star magazine of April 22, 1962:

A favorite of the Russians is cheesecake, and the Ukrainians make paska, an Easter bread baked with cheese. The Greeks bake little cheese tarts called tyropeta, and kouloura, bread with a red egg in the center.

When I asked a Greek woman why their eggs are dyed red, she said: "That is a story I remember from childhood. Mary Magdalene was carrying a basket of eggs which turned red at the time of the Crucifixion."

The red eggs are used in a cracking ceremony at the beginning of the Easter meal. The family members tap their eggs together, trying to crack one another's while keeping their own unbroken.

Easter eggs are universal but varied in appearance. The Ukrainians make designs in wax on their eggs before dyeing them. The designs are characteristic of different regions and look like copies of Ukrainian embroidery.

Local Orthodox congregations—Greek, Russian, Ukrainian, Syrian, Serbian and Carpatho-Russian—are united in acceptance of the doctrine of the ancient church. Their religious observances during the Holy Week will be similar, but will be conducted in different liturgical languages.

The interior of an Orthodox church is different from a Roman Catholic or Protestant church. The altar stands behind a partition called the Iconostasis which has double doors at the center called the Royal Gates.

There is no statuary in their churches, it being too strong a reminder of old pagan idols. Instead, there are flat pictures called icons.

Explaining the icons of Sts. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church, Father Demetrios G. Kalaris told me: "Icons are meant to render visibly the mysteries of the supernatural world. They do not mean to depict life as it is, but rather are a mystical representation of life as it is in eternity."

The sacred drama of the Orthodox ritual is particularly pronounced in some of the Holy Week services and the Resurrection celebration. Because their church day begins at sundown, some of the evening services commemorate events associated with the next day.

The Reenactment of the Crucifixion will be held in every Orthodox church next Thursday evening. Following the gospel lessons telling of the Lord's Passion, a large crucifix with the icon of Christ will be placed in the center of the church. It will remain there until Friday afternoon when, in the service of the Unnailing of Christ from the Cross, the body, or icon, is removed, wrapped in a white shroud, and placed upon the altar.

Women of the church will adorn the bier, called the Epitaphios, with flowers in preparation for the Service of Lamentations Friday evening. By candlelight, the worshippers will join in procession around the church,

kiss the Epitaphios, and pass under it to receive its Divine Grace. The flowers will be distributed among the congregation as sacred talismans.

The Russian Orthodox will begin their Easter Eve midnight service with a procession around the outside of the church. At midnight, the doors of the church will open as the priest proclaims, "Christos Voskres" (Slavonic for Christ has Risen).

The Greek churches will be darkened before midnight Easter Eve, symbolic of the darkness of the tomb. At midnight the Royal Gates of the Iconostasis will open as the priest comes out to announce, "Christos Anesti" (Greek for Christ has Risen). From the priest's candles light is passed to the candles of the congregation, and each worshipper will attempt to keep his candle burning until reaching home.

Midst the merriment of Sunday's festivities, the people will return to church in the afternoon for the vesper Service of Love. The spirit of love, engendered by their faith, is kindled to a moving climax during the Easter celebrations. There rejoicing for the spread of Christianity throughout the world, and the sharing of God's love among people everywhere, is emphasized in this service when the gospel is read in many languages.

At the close of the service they openly express their joyfulness in sharing God's love when they exchange with other parishioners "the kiss of the Resurrection."

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAILEY ATTACKS GOP FOR PLAYING POLITICS WITH EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the American tradition is clear on a major point—education and politics do not mix, and that is the way the American people prefer it.

Yet, today, Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, as we know it, is in danger of being destroyed. Therefore, we welcome the opinions, strong as they may be, of political leaders throughout the United States. We are fighting to save a crucial institution which was established only after years of educational neglect and deprivation for too many of our citizens.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable John Bailey, of Connecticut, on April 25, issued, to my mind, one of the clearest critiques of current efforts to gut Federal aid to public and private elementary and secondary schools. His thoughts bear repeating, especially because he laments the intrusion of partisan politics into an area which has traditionally been non-political.

Mr. Bailey's remarks are highly relevant because he calls Republican efforts by their true name—the "last great stand against educational progress in America."

I include his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF CHAIRMAN BAILEY'S STATEMENT

We are today witnessing the Republican Party's last great stand against educational progress in America.

For political reasons—and for political reasons alone—the Republican policy makers—by supporting H.R. 8983—have decided to destroy the basic purpose of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; frustrate its intent; confuse its immensely successful programs; and deprive the American people—and their children—of the massive educational benefits of one of the most far-reaching educational opportunity programs in history.

Speaking as a political leader, I must express my deep sorrow and profound regret that Republican politics has intruded itself into an area which is traditionally above politics—education. Our children will be the losers.

The Republicans call their recent efforts an "amendment" to the existing Federal aid to education program. But it is not an amendment at all. It is a very shrewd but blatant and cynical attempt to dismantle the entire Federal aid to education program. It is an attempt to capture votes by using the phony charge of Federal control of education.

What was the intent of the Congress when it passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and when President Johnson, in a proud moment, signed it into law?

The basic thrust of the Act is "to provide financial assistance . . . to local education agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs . . . which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

Let there be no doubt in anybody's mind that the Republicans are out to kill that section of the Act. Let there be no illusions that there are guarantees in the Republican proposals under which accepted national policy on aid to the educationally deprived will be carried out. The Republicans would have us forget that one of the major reasons why there is an aid to elementary and secondary education program today, is that the nation decided, as a matter of policy, that it had a duty to alleviate poverty, and more specifically, to reduce the terrible educational consequences which poverty breeds. This, the Republicans policy makers would reverse, even though they use polite, catchy phrases to hide their true intent.

The Republican proposal would undo the successes of the first year's operation of Federal aid to local education. Under Title I of the Act, more than eight million children in more than 1,700 school districts across the nation have enjoyed the benefits of Federal aid. They received those benefits in programs ranging from educational television to remedial reading, from summer science courses to hot lunches.

The Republicans would tear asunder the first real Federal, State and local consensus on educational goals in our history. This consensus has already produced unprecedented educational innovation in many towns and cities.

The Republican proposals would undo the spirit of cooperation on educational goals fostered by Federal support for joint public and private use of educational materials and facilities.

The Republicans advertise their proposals as beneficial to the states. On fact and philosophy they are wrong. The Republican amendments would reduce Federal funds to many states, in spite of statements to the contrary. Both New York and Mississippi, to name only two, would receive millions of dollars less in Federal aid than they receive under existing law. Other states would also receive body-blow reductions in Federal aid if the Republican bill is successful—and many of them would be those least able to afford it. Virtually every major city in the country would lose funds. Contrary to the impressions fostered by the Republican pro-

posals, there is absolutely no guarantee that school districts with low financial capacity would be given the priority they are given today. This would mark a blunt and unfeeling end to the national priority which the Congress has established—to meet the special needs of children in our midst who had been deprived of equal educational opportunity simply because they are poor or because their towns or cities are poor.

The Republican education measure is economic discrimination at its worst.

Are the states rushing to join the Republicans in their efforts to kill Federal aid to elementary and secondary education? The answer is, no! The states are describing President Johnson's program as an educational revolution and clearly want it to continue.

Are the professional educational organizations joining the thin ranks of Republicans diehards to return aid to education philosophy to a bygone era? The answer is, no!

Are the private schools in the United States in favor of the Quile amendments? The answer is, no! The existing Act has already yielded significant benefits to both private and public education.

The technical problems which Representative Quile seems obsessed with are being overcome. Educational innovation and change will test our capacity to perfect our programs. States and localities and the Federal Government are cooperating to achieve a great national purpose. Let us not abandon what is one of the most significant educational programs in American history.

I urge all educators, all educational leaders, all civic and nonpartisan groups throughout the nation to speak loudly and clearly against current Republican efforts to kill Federal aid to education as we now know it. This is a fight I know all Americans will join.

TARIFF ON GLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 of this year the President, on the advice from the Tariff Commission, canceled all of the escape clause tariff increases on flat glass except for a few categories of sheet glass. President Kennedy had put the tariff increases into effect in March 1962.

The President has canceled out other escape clause tariff increases, so that all of the actions taken to protect domestic industries and their employees from the destructive effect of excessive imports have now been removed except for two—typewriter ribbon cloth and Wilton and velvet carpets. The Tariff Commission is currently investigating the effect of canceling these, and under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 these tariff increases will automatically expire in October of this year unless the President takes the initiative of continuing their life.

Mr. Speaker, the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor is engaged in an extensive investigation into the impact of imports on employment in the United States. The subcommittee held hearings during the last session of Congress and has spent many days in hearings during the current session. Our subcommittee has heard witnesses from more industries and more labor organizations describing the current impact of imports

on jobs in America than any other committee of the Congress.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I believe I am in a position therefore to speak with some authority on the implications of the Nation's full employment policy of the recent actions of the President in canceling escape clause tariff adjustments including, specifically, those on flat glass.

The flat glass tariff adjustments are of great importance to residents of my district. I have devoted countless hours to the matter of securing relief from excessive imports for the workers in the flat glass industry. I personally discussed the case on many occasions with President Kennedy and his advisers when the matter was initially under study. I have also attempted to inform the administration and its advisers of the importance of this matter to the people of my district and to the Nation, but without favorable results.

When the President's action canceling the tariff adjustments on flat glass was announced, I was tempted to take the floor of the House and protest his action because of my knowledge that conditions in the flat glass industry have not so improved as to warrant the lowering of the tariff. I refrained from doing so, however, and set about to renew my own investigation of the situation to be certain that I was up to date on the latest developments affecting employment in the flat glass industry.

I felt it especially important to do this, in view of the fact that the action in canceling the flat-glass tariffs was based upon a Tariff Commission report completed in June of 1965. It was my belief that it was possible that the conditions presented in that report had materially changed since its preparation, and that later occurring events detrimental to employment in the industry might not have been presented fully to the President.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I have studied the economic data of the flat-glass industry carefully, including foreign trade data, through calendar year 1966—two full calendar years beyond the date at which the information in the Tariff Commission's report to the President stopped. I have also conferred with officials of the labor unions representing the workers in this industry, and with representatives of the companies involved in the domestic production of flat glass. Here, then, is a report of my findings.

EMPLOYMENT

From its high point of 36,500 workers in 1957, the flat-glass industry's employment declined to 29,900 workers in 1961, the last full year prior to the action of President Kennedy in making a partial withdrawal of the tariff concessions on sheet glass in 1962. With the help provided by the stabilizing effect of the tariff adjustment on the flat-glass market, U.S. employment in the industry rose slowly to 32,800 workers in the calendar year 1966—a 9.7-percent increase. By contrast, employment in all manufacturing industries rose at nearly twice this rate—16.8 percent between 1961 and 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the improvement in employment in the flat-glass industry, while

encouraging, still left that industry far off the pace of the rest of U.S. manufacturing industry in generating jobs for the growing work force in America.

The high point in the flat-glass industry's employment was reached in November 1965 at 33,700 employees. Then a gradual decline in employment set in, reaching its low in February 1967 at 32,200 workers—a net loss of 1,500 jobs from the peak employment in November 1965. This clearly is a development not reflected in the Tariff Commission's report to the President in June 1965.

PRODUCTIVITY

The flat glass industry and its workers made impressive strides in productivity during this period. In 1961, the last full calendar year preceding the tariff adjustment, the Federal Reserve Board's Index of Production in the "flat and other glass" industry stood at 104.2 based on an index in which the average of 1957-59 equals 100. This production index rose steadily, and for the calendar year 1966, averaged 167.2. Thus, production increased by 60 percent during the 1961-66 period, in comparison with a 10-percent increase in employment.

This sharp increase in productivity gives the lie to those who attempt to justify the President's action on the ground that the industry's problem is one of efficiency in comparison with its foreign competitors. The increased output was brought about, in part at least, by the investment in new plants and equipment made by the industry since the time of the tariff adjustment, encouraged by the stabilizing effect of that tariff adjustment on imports.

In June 1965 when the Tariff Commission's report was issued, the Federal Reserve Board's Index of Industrial Production in the flat glass industry stood at 147.5. By December 1966, this had risen to 172.6, a 17-percent increase. Thus, joint and determined efforts of the industry and its workers to increase productivity and to be as competitive as possible with foreign-produced flat glass have continued from June 1965 to date.

The success achieved in these efforts, however, in view of the failure of the domestic flat glass market to grow sufficiently to absorb the increased output of the domestic industry and the increased imports has been erased by the loss of employment to which I have previously referred. This situation has been made more distressing by the depression created in the industries supplying material for the construction of new houses as a result of the impact of the monetary policies on new housing starts. These well-known facts are referred to in the recently published annual report of the Federal Reserve System covering operations for the year 1966. The report states that:

In contrast to expansion in most other sectors, residential construction activity declined sharply. Nonfarm housing starts, which had shown an irregular downtrend during the previous 2 years, dropped to unusually low levels after midyear and in the fourth quarter were at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of less than 1 million units.

The number of new housing starts in 1966 was the lowest since 1957. As the report indicates:

The steepness of the drop in housing starts reflected for the most part the restrictive conditions that developed in the mortgage market toward the end of 1965 and the further tightening during most of 1966.

Consider the position of the flat glass industry in the light of these developments. The Federal Government's monetary policy severely damaged the principal market which generates demands for sheet glass. Energetic efforts to increase productivity to become more competitive with imports eliminated jobs as declining demand and a sluggish market failed to provide an outlet for the industry's increased production capabilities. Inrushing imports compounded the felony by further disruption of the domestic market. At this moment of time, the administration cancels President Kennedy's escape clause tariff adjustment, opening wide this distressed American market for flat glass to the surplus production capabilities of the European and Japanese producers.

Mr. Speaker, the distress in the housing industry caused by the monetary policy is another development which took place after the Tariff Commission's report to the President in June of 1965.

PRICES

The excessive import pressures which preceded the tariff adjustment in 1962 contributed to a steady decline in wholesale prices through 1962. From the average of 1957-59 as 100, the wholesale price index for flat glass declined to 97 in 1962. The index returned to 100 in September 1963, under the market-stabilizing force of the tariff adjustment. Thereafter it remained virtually unchanged until September 1966 when the wholesale price index for flat glass stood at 100.6.

During this period, from September 1963 to September 1966, the average hourly earnings of production workers in the flat-glass industry increased 3.8 percent, from \$3.40 to \$3.53. This modest increase reflects long-continued forbearance on the part of workers in the flat-glass industry to assist the industry during the difficult period of rebuilding a position in markets stabilized by President Kennedy's escape clause tariff adjustment.

In the last quarter of 1966, however, events, including the cost of inflation to workers, forced a sharp upward movement in the average hourly earnings of the workers in the flat-glass industry. In November 1966 they reached \$3.68—a 4.2-percent increase in the space of a few months. Prices followed the upward movement of average hourly earnings. By November 1966, the wholesale price index moved to 103.3, where it has remained ever since.

With employment down, average hourly earnings of production workers up, and prices adjusted to meet the added wage costs, the industry is in an especially awkward position for the alteration in the ground rules of competition, and the additional margin of price advantage, which the rescission of the escape clause tariff adjustment creates for the benefit of foreign producers.

Mr. Speaker, the wage and price increases which I have referred to are also a development which has occurred since

the June 1965 date of the Tariff Commission's report to the President.

EARNINGS

In 1965 the flat-glass industry's "gross earnings," before taxes and before payment of indirect costs, such as depreciation, interest charges, rents, royalties, and other indirect costs, were equal to 31.6 percent of the value of shipments. In 1961, the last full year before the tariff adjustment, when sharply rising imports were adversely affecting the domestic market for flat glass, the industry's gross earnings were equivalent to 22 percent of the value of shipments. There is little doubt that the economic state of the industry improved considerably during the period 1961-65 with the benefit of the more stable market conditions which the tariff adjustment helped to bring about.

The consumer did not suffer, as until the very recent wage and price increases, the wholesale price index remained virtually unchanged. As we have seen jobs increased, wages were higher, and the industry's earnings improved under the beneficial and more stable market conditions created by the tariff adjustment. A more salutary result of a tariff adjustment could not be asked. But the achievement of these conditions is not the signal to bring back the chaotic market conditions which characterized the era of excessive imports, prior to the tariff adjustment in 1962.

Furthermore, the results which the industry can reasonably expect to achieve in 1967 are not expected to be as good as 1965 because of the impact which the tight money market and the administration's monetary policies have created in the housing industry, as I have previously explained. To quote the Department of Commerce in its recent publication *U.S. Industry Outlook in 1967*:

Credit stringencies which in 1966 were mainly responsible for the sharp drop in new private housing starts are also likely to have a somewhat delayed effect in 1967 on State and locally owned construction. Private non-residential building construction will also be affected, since it, too, is somewhat dependent upon raising funds in the money market.

In other words, conditions created by domestic governmental policies and the effort to damp down the inflationary effects of the Vietnam affair are causing distress for the flat-glass industry and its workers in common with other basic industries, the pace of whose activity is sensitive to credit restraints. Therefore, this is a most inopportune time for the Government to precipitate still other forms of economic distress by rescinding the tariff adjustment on flat glass.

FOREIGN TRADE IN FLAT GLASS

Mr. Speaker, it is often assumed and widely proclaimed by free trade advocates that the effect of a selective tariff adjustment through our escape clause procedure is to harm the foreign trade of the United States. Commentators in the press oftentimes refer to tariff increases as though they were an absolute embargo on continued importation of the goods subject to the tariff increase. The Members of this body who have looked into import problems on behalf of their constituents know that this is not so.

Certainly in the case of sheet glass and other flat glass, the tariff adjustment authorized by President Kennedy in 1962 has not had an unduly restrictive effect on imports into the United States. Rather, it has served to stabilize imports at the high volume which they achieved in 1962, the year of the tariff adjustment. Let me illustrate this by a few statistics.

In 1961, the last full calendar year before the tariff adjustment, U.S. imports for consumption of sheet glass were equivalent to 375 million pounds, valued at \$27 million. In 1966, under the higher tariffs made possible by the 1962 adjustment, U.S. imports for consumption of sheet glass rose to 465 million pounds, valued at \$29 million. The quantity imported was considerably higher than in any of the years 1961, 1963, or 1965, though slightly lower than the quantity imported in 1962 and 1964. The principal source of these imports was the EEC and EFTA countries of Europe, and Japan. About 11 percent of the imports in 1966 originated behind the Iron Curtain.

The significance of these statistics is that the tariff adjustment has not effected any real reduction in the volume or value of imports from the levels achieved prior to the tariff increase.

When we look at the import data for all flat glass, we find that 1966 was the best of recent years. Thus, in 1964 the total dollar value of flat glass imports from all countries was \$55.6 million and this increased in 1966 to \$60.2 million.

Because of the differing classification systems used for imports and exports in the United States, and the somewhat different coverage of our foreign trade classifications from the classifications used by other countries, it is rather difficult to get a precise view of the position of the U.S. flat glass industry in world trade.

Making allowances for these differences, it appears to me that, in terms of the classification description used in the United Nations foreign trade statistics, the United States in 1965, the latest year for which full data are available, imported about \$40 million worth of flat glass as defined in those statistics while exporting about \$19 million worth.

If this analysis is correct, it would appear that we have a significant deficit in our balance of trade in flat glass. Furthermore, it seems that our \$19 million of exports represent only 13 percent of the exports of flat glass by the principal producing countries. The EEC countries, for whose benefit principally the President acted to rescind the 1962 tariff adjustment, supplied about 74 percent of total world exports of flat glass in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has constitutional responsibilities for the regulation of foreign and domestic commerce. The President has responsibilities in the area of foreign affairs to establish and maintain good relations with other nations, but he also has continuing responsibilities for the general welfare of the American people. It seems to me that the two branches of Government, in the discharge of these responsibilities, must attempt to achieve a form of justice to both foreign and domestic interests. On

the one hand, we should provide access to the American market for foreign producers in the interest of our foreign affairs and of U.S. consumers; in doing so, however, we also have the duty to moderate our judgments to the extent that our own people can continue to have reasonable access to the American market. The extent to which our people in their production efforts are limited in their access to foreign markets should moderate the degree of access which we afford other countries.

Now the application of these sensible principles to the flat glass situation certainly requires that we take into account the very minor share which the U.S. flat glass industry has in world trade in flat glass. It also requires that we take note of the fact that the tariff adjustment of 1962 has served both to permit the maintenance of a strong foreign position in the U.S. market and a gradual increase in the volume of foreign-produced flat glass imported into the United States.

Whereas we have limited access to the markets of other countries, they have major access to the U.S. market under conditions brought about by the tariff adjustment which tend to create stability in the U.S. market for the benefit of both the U.S. industry and the foreign producers who are sharing that market.

Justice to the American people also requires that we take note of the fact that forces are at work within the American economy which are producing a loss of employment in the U.S. flat glass industry which will be compounded by an inrush of increased imports stimulated by the administration's action in rescinding President Kennedy's tariff adjustment on flat glass.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the administration's action in rescinding the tariff adjustment on flat glass was inadequately or improperly evaluated by the President's advisers. I see this case as an example of a callousness on the part of the Federal Government to the legitimate interest and needs of American workers and businessmen. I see it as an unnecessary and gratuitous extension of the already considerable trade benefits enjoyed by foreign countries in their access to the U.S. market.

I regret the Government's action and can only conclude that in our compassion for the American workingman and the strength of the American economy we acted upon an insufficient or improper evaluation of the situation by our advisers.

To the Members of this body I commend the flat glass case as an example of the maladministration of the adjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is evidence of a type of abuse which we must be certain to remedy in any new trade legislation taken up by the Congress in the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. AREND) for the balance of the week, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. GARDNER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 1 and 2, 1967, on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. CORMAN, for May 3 and 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. BIESTER), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELL.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. MATHIAS of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. GARMATZ.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 823. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate oil and gas lease Las Cruces 063610; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section

10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1039. An act to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 3, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

714. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, for the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

715. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of pricing methods used by the various States in the purchase of prescribed drugs under federally aided public assistance programs, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

716. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the acquisition and installation of computers by the U.S. Army, Pacific, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

717. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. **FISHER**: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2082. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to certain members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **RIVERS**: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9240. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **MATSUNAGA**: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 460. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 263, joint resolution relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. **ANDERSON** of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution for consideration of S. 1216. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89-754, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. **BATES**:

H.R. 9530. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **BERRY**:

H.R. 9531. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a segment of the Great Prairie Parkway in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9532. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. **BLATNIK**:

H.R. 9533. A bill to provide a program for dairy farmers under which production adjustment payment shall be made to such farmers who voluntarily adjust their marketing of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. **BURLESON**:

H.R. 9534. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **BUTTON**:

H.R. 9535. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **CLEVELAND**:

H.R. 9536. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes by increasing the amount of the payments which may be made by the Veterans' Administration for the care of cer-

tain veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. **CORMAN**:

H.R. 9537. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9538. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9539. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide pension increases for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, for widows of such veterans, and for the children of such veterans who are deceased; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9540. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **DUNCAN**:

H.R. 9541. A bill to provide for computation of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. **EDWARDS** of California:

H.R. 9542. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **HATHAWAY**:

H.R. 9543. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to increase the amount of assistance to such academies and to provide a minimum subsistence payable per student; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. **McFALL**:

H.R. 9544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **MATSUNAGA**:

H.R. 9545. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the detail of Federal employees to States and political subdivisions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **O'KONSKI**:

H.R. 9546. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **PATMAN** (for himself, Mr.

MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 9547. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act in authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. **POLANCO-ABREU**:

H.R. 9548. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **ROTH**:

H.R. 9549. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9550. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give to employers and performers in the performing arts the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 9551. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9552. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 9553. A bill to determine the rights and interest of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9554. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 9555. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9556. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 9557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the income tax exemption for interest on State and local obligations does not extend to obligations issued by a private corporation, regardless of their nature or purpose or any approval given or other action taken with respect to them by a State or municipality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 9558. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes by increasing the amount of the payments which may be made by the Veterans' Administration for the care of certain veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 9559. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9560. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 9561. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act requiring contracts for the construction, alteration, and repair of any public building or public work of the United States to be accompanied by a performance bond protecting the United States and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor for the construction, alteration, or repair of said public buildings or public work," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9562. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved

for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 9563. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 548. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. SCHWENGLER):

H.J. Res. 549. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 550. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 551. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to the establishment of a permanent national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

170. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to proposed construction of Teton Basin Lower Teton division, Idaho; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

171. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the great disparity between the prices paid to the farmer and the prices paid by the consumer for agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

172. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to opposition to increasing the tariff or tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

173. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the Nooksack Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

174. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to cooperation with State officials on State laws regulating the grain shipping industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

175. By Mr. PEPPER: Memorial of the Florida State Senate, relative to the distribution of excise tax collections on alcoholic beverages and tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 9564. A bill for the relief of Florentino R. Murillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9565. A bill for the relief of Kwang Baick Kim and his wife, Jung Ryo Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9566. A bill for the relief of Francis M. Rogallo and Gertrude S. Rogallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9567. A bill for the relief of Noel S. Marston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9568. A bill for the relief of Lucien A. Murzyn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 9569. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land in Leavenworth County, Kans., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9570. A bill for the relief of Domenico R. Rotiroli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9571. A bill for the relief of Miss Corazon Chu Cea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chen Yuan Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9573. A bill for the relief of Gustavo L. Iraola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 9574. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, to Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the blessings of home and of friendship, and the sacrament of beauty. In the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the strength wherewith to do it.

In the vast difficulties confronting the makers of peace in these days so full of tension, restore and strengthen and sustain our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness: for Thy name's sake.

So distill upon us the dew of quietness and confidence that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast and abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in Him, and for Him, and with Him, our labor is not in vain.

So send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with an unruffled tranquillity which is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. Hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age, our calling to fulfill.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter: